

2-5

INDIAN IDEALS

ANNIE BESANT

ADYAR

K.P. No. 2/-

INDIAN IDEALS



INDIAN IDEALS

IN

EDUCATION

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

ART

BEING THE KAMALA LECTURES

FOR 1924-25

DELIVERED AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY

BY

ANNIE BESANT, D.L.

1965

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE

ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA

© The Theosophical Publishing House, 1965

First Edition 1925

Second „ 1930

Third „ 1965

PRINTED IN INDIA

At the Vasanta Press, The Theosophical Society,
Adyar, Madras 20.

FOREWORD TO FIRST EDITION

DR. ASHUTOSH MUKERJI, Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, founded a Trust in the name of his dearly loved daughter, under which a Kamala Lecturer was to be appointed every year, to deliver three Lectures, first in Calcutta University and then in some other. He passed away suddenly before the first Lecturer was appointed, but he had chosen me for that honorable office, and I accordingly delivered the Lectures on January 12, 13, 14, 1925, under the Presidency of the Vice-Chancellor.

They were subsequently delivered in the Hindu University of Benares, and the University of Lucknow.

ANNIE BESANT

THE KAMALA LECTURES

WHEN the great Indian of the powerful brain and lion-heart, planned this Lectureship in the name of his beloved daughter, who had hurried before him into the Land of Light and Peace, the Father's tender thought wove this dear memory into the very fabric of the University he loved so well. He could not have dreamed, in the strong maturity of powers which showed no sign of weakening, and seemed still to promise many years of ripened wisdom and of useful service to his Motherland, that he would not see the first Kamala lecturer open the courses which were to keep her memory green.

Yet since it is written: "The non-existent cannot become; neither can the existent cease to be"; and since "this dweller in the body is ever invulnerable," let us not mourn for those who live eternally, because the bodies have perished, but rather send a thought of love and homage to the Father and the Daughter, reunited in a happier life, and linked together here.

I. EDUCATION

WE are to seek for the Indian Ideals which flowered into the National Life; for every country has its own Ideals, and according to the nature of the Thought which is the generating Seed, so is the nature of the National Life which grows up therefrom, and sends forth the branches and bursts into the blossoms which are the products of the National Activity.

Says the Upanishat: "Man is created by Thought, and what a man thinks upon that he becomes; therefore think upon Brahman."¹ So also with Nations, since there is no creative Thought other than that of Brahman in manifestation; and because there were so many in India who ever thought of that Supreme, therefore did India flower out into a civilisation unrivalled in the depth of its Philosophy, in the spirituality of its Religion, and in the perfection of its Dharma of orderly and graded Individual and National Life, expressing as none other has ever done that balance, that equilibrium, which is Yoga, that which saved her, when all the contemporaries of her splendid Nationality have been carried away by Time's tremendous rapids, and scattered as wrecks over the far horizon of the boundless Ocean of the Past. She shares their Past, but they do not share her Future, for not theirs the secret of her immortal Youth.

¹ *Chhândogyop.*, III, xiv, 1.

And what is that secret? It lay hidden in her Education and her Culture, or rather in the Ideals which created these; for the Ideal is prior to the form, and if today men think that her strength is dissipated, her energy outworn, it is because she has for a moment—for what is a century and a half but a moment in her millennial life?—sold her birthright, as her Mother's first-born child, for a mess of western pottage. Let her turn again to her Ideals, and she shall renew her strength. For Ideals are the generating Life which unfolds through many incarnations, embodies itself in many a successive form, but remains ever true to type. We, who believe in India's Immortality, do not need to reproduce the bodies, the forms, of the past; but we need that that life, the life of the Mother Immortal, shall embody itself in new forms, but that it shall be Her Life, and not another's.

Let us distinguish between Education and Culture.

Education is the drawing out and training of inborn capacities and powers—brought over from former lives and developed in the Svārgic or Deva world—which lie as germs in the Vijñānamayakosha, the intellectual aspect of the reincarnating Self, the triple-faced Jivātmā, or Ātma-Buddhi-Manas. These germs, ready to sprout forth and to grow, germs of the qualities which are to manifest through the Manomayakosha, are, as it were, sown in that stage of the consciousness which we call the Lower Manas, for the expression of which, with the emotions, the Manomayakosha is framed. First, the preparatory stage of reincarnation begins in which this kosha,

the sheath of the mind and the emotions, is formed; then followed the Prānamayakosha, that of passions and life-energy; and then the Annamayakosha, the sheath formed by food, the dense physical body. These three are new with each rebirth, and education has not only to draw out and distribute the germs through each sheath, but to develop them, train, and make the sheath sensitive and responsive to the impacts from the external world, accurate in recording them, and in sending them on to the mind, which connects the impression with the object causing it, and thus establishes relations between itself and the outer world, these relations and the action of the mind upon them being Knowledge. Observation by the sense-organs in the physical body; the effects of these on the sense-centres, as sensations; the perception by and the action of the mind on these by memory, analysis, comparison, classification, inter-relations (causes and effects), reasoning on them, anticipation, all these form the field of Knowledge which is tilled by Education.

Culture is the result on the mind of certain forms of Knowledge, and is based on these; but it differs from Education in that it is not the drawing out and training of faculty, but is the result of the exercise of faculties on subjects which arouse sympathetic emotion and imagination, broadening the mind, eliminating personal, local and racial prejudices, acquiring an understanding of human nature in its many aspects, and contacting the life-side rather than the form-side of creatures; hence the quick internal response to other lives, and the intuition of the unity of life beneath

the diversity of life-expressions. The difference between Education and Culture is symbolised by the condition of entry into the School of Pythagoras, acquaintance with "Mathematics and Music"—the capacity to use the Intellect—Higher Manas, or Manas in the *Vijñānamayakosha*—by synthesising the products of the mind and discovering the laws producing them, and by the purifying of the emotions by Beauty. Literature and Art are the instruments of Culture. Science and the "clear cold light" of reason are the area and the guide of Education. The Life in Nature and the intellectual intuition, which recognises truth by its harmony with his own nature—"whose nature is Knowledge"—are the area and the guide of Culture. If these are completely separated during the plastic period of youth, Science tends to hardness, and, in over-specialisation, to narrowmindedness and intolerance; Culture tends, when exaggerated, to false sentiment and fastidiousness in non-essentials. The training of the instruments of knowledge and the storing of the memory with facts is the work of Education by others in youth, and their application to new facts and conditions is the self-education which continues during life. Culture in youth consists in the unconscious development and refinement of passions into emotions amid beautiful surroundings, for the contact with beautiful objects and the evoking and the control of the emotions in response to them, and the moulding of these by Literature and Art develop the discrimination which is an element in self-culture, the critical faculty which manifests as a balanced judgment, not as mere fault-finding, and

lends poise, dignity and gentleness to the attitude towards life. We shall see in a few moments how Beauty was an essential feature of the Indian Ideal of Education and Culture, and necessity for the revival of this Ideal in modern life.

But let us first realise two fundamental differences between Ancient and Modern Systems of Education in their relation to the State, one of them prevailing alike in India and in Britain, and the other peculiar to India.

In the Ancient System of India, Education and Culture were self-controlled, and while the State, the organised Nation, profited by them and from them drew its dignity, its religion, its morality, its effectiveness, and its consequent efficiency, the Legislative and Executive Departments of its Government exercised over them no control, and did not interfere with their management. Kings built Universities and bestowed on them wealth, but claimed in them no authority. A Monarch might enter into the Convocation of a University, but no one rose to greet him and he took his seat like any other visitor; but on the entrance of its Head, the "Venerable of Venerables," all rose and turned their faces towards him and in silence awaited his words. The University was the Temple of Learning, and the learned were its only Hierophants. When Learning visited Royalty, when a Wise One entered a Court, even Shri Krishna descended from His throne and bowed at the feet of the Sage.

In the Modern System, Education is under the control of a Government Department, the Legislature makes laws for it, the Executive appoints its Directors,

or the Ministers, who are really its masters, sends its Inspectors into its Schools and Colleges, and puts the Educators into a steel-frame, which it misnames efficiency. This is now alike in East and West. But in India, where Kings had been its nursing fathers and had poured out their treasures at its feet, the foreign Government ignored the Ancient System, and, as its Rule spread, Education and Culture died of starvation in the kingdoms which became provinces. The splendid inheritance from the Indian Past—Hindū, Buddhist and Muslim—disappeared, leaving only the Schools of Pandits, maintained by Indian Princes, or by the reverent charity of the Hindūs, till but one University, that of Nadiya, survived; the Temple and Musjid schools remained for a while and the mufasal village school—that which the East India Company, on being compelled by the British Parliament to spend a lakh on Education, called in 1814, “this venerable and benevolent institution of the Hindūs,”¹ after the testimony of Sir Thomas Munro in 1813, that there were “schools established in every village”.² The E. I. Co. ascribed to these “the general intelligence of the natives as scribes and accountants”.³ Dr. John Matthai, in his *Village Administration in British India*, says that “when the British took possession of the country,” they found in most parts of the country (except western and central India) that “there existed

¹ *Village Administration in British India*, Chap. II, para v, p. 43..

² Evidence before the Two Houses of Parliament, March and April, 1813, see Note D, in James Mill's *History of British India*, Vol. I, p. 371, 5th edition.

³ Matthai, *loc. cit.*

a widespread system of national Education".¹ Even in 1838, Adam's Reports show a similar state of things in Bengal. He reports the results of an enquiry, held in 1835-1838, made in typical districts of the Presidency, and found both Toles and Madrasahs (High Schools) and Pāthashālas and Maktabas (schools attached to Temples and Musjids). The colleges were found, he writes, in "all the large villages as in the towns. The age of the scholars was from about five or six to sixteen. The curriculum included reading, writing, the composition of letters, and elementary arithmetic and accounts, either commercial, or agricultural, or both". I may add that in the village schools "Elementary Arithmetic" included multiplication tables not of only 12×12 , but up to 20×20 . The schools however continued to diminish in number. The *Quinquennial Review* for 1907-1912, shows 2,051 Madrasahs in 1907 against 1,446 in 1912, and 10,504 Musjid Schools in 1907 against 8,288 in 1912.

Let me pause for a moment on the age of the scholars mentioned above. In the old days, the education of the child up to the age of seven seems to have been more in the home than in the school. From seven to sixteen, the boy was to be taught and trained in school, and then to pass on to the University. The stage of infancy ends at seven, and up to that age, the body should be the first care, and lessons should be in the form of play, and great freedom of choice should be given to the little ones. No care in later life can restore the stamina of the body ill nourished, or unwisely nourished during those first

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 42.

seven years of life. With the joint family system there were children enough in the household, including those of the dependents, to make a society for the children, in which they learned unconsciously lessons of kindness, of courtesy, of gentle manners and refined speech, of little sacrifices born of love, of mutual helpfulness and mutual service. With the narrowing of the home circle, the playing school is in many ways better and the children are happier in the merry games and the gay company of their little comrades. But the school must be well chosen, the teachers tender and helpful, songs, stories and play that exercises and trains the senses, the hand and the eye, and teaches graceful harmonious movements, are enough.

From seven to fourteen are the years for training the memory and the emotions, for the stories of heroism and of virtue that inspire, drawn from the history of the Motherland, and great men and women; stories too of other countries; of all that can arouse enthusiasm and inspire to service. Thus will the children have their minds and emotions so trained as to fit them to cross in safety the perilous bridge between childhood and youth. From fourteen to twenty-one is the time for hard mental study. By sixteen, the special capacities will have shown themselves, and will mark out the best avocation for the future life, and specialised Education may safely begin. This is but the barest indication of the broad stages in the preparation for manhood and womanhood, the Ideal of the Student Order of the well regulated life.¹ But the knell of popular education was struck in 1854, when

¹ *Ancient Indian Education*, Rev. F. E. Keay, pp. 145, 146.

Sir Charles Wood tried, and the Government supported, the singular experiment of teaching the people in a foreign tongue, with the result that after seventy years, 3.4 per cent of the people receive primary education. So we have three stages in Education in India in relation to the State: I. Lavish help from Rulers and complete liberty of Education, paid for by the wealthy and free to the poor, who, in exchange, served their teachers and performed household duties; II. Entire neglect for 97 years, with an interval of a lakh a year spent on it; III. The Government English-speaking Schools, and Colleges, and later Universities with, of recent years, partial and grudging introduction of the vernaculars.

How shall we apply the Indian Ideals to the salvation of Modern Education and Culture in India? That is the question which Indian Universities alone can solve, and before they can answer it, nay, before they can even begin the task, the old relationship must be recreated between the State and the Universities. Learning must again be inspired with the Ancient Ideals, and these will be embodied in new forms. And in order that these new forms shall be expressions of India's life, and not strait jackets to confine her, the old freedom must be restored to Education and Culture. Governments should assign to educational and cultural institutions the material means for their support, gifts of land, grants of money for buildings, and for the necessary equipment, so that they may be able to give to the Nation the priceless assets of learned and skilled men and women of high character, to carry on the work in every department of national life. Money given to Education by the Nation is not a gift,

but an investment. It returns high interest to the Nation as well as power and happiness to the individual. Learned men produce literature which raises the Nation in the eyes of the world and, far more important, spreads knowledge over the earth, literature which ennobles and inspires not only contemporaries, but generations yet unborn. Science makes discoveries which add to human knowledge, increase man's power over the forces of Nature, and—if it tread only righteous paths—will preserve, uplift and strengthen human life and human happiness. By Education and Culture of man's spiritual, intellectual, emotional and physical nature can he be lifted from the savage to the Sage and the Saint, can poverty be abolished, can society be made fraternal instead of barbarous, can crime, the fruit of ignorance, be gotten rid of, and international and social peace replace war and the strife of classes. Avidyā is the mother of poverty, of sorrow, of misery. It is the darkness which the Sun of Vidyā must chase away.

A generation of really educated people, with a proportion of the cultured, will change the face of India. Japan educated her people in forty years. As rapid as was the destruction may be the recovery, and each successive generation will show an improved result. Already Indian Ministers have made Primary Education free in seven Provinces and compulsory in three, compulsion to be introduced as rapidly as possible in the other four. When India gains her own political freedom, may she be wise enough to restore freedom to Education and Culture, and, once more, the highest honor to Learning.

After Freedom in the Educational and Cultural field is won, for it is not possible until this freedom is possessed, the very first thing must be the restoration of the Mother-tongues of India to their proper place in that field. Nothing so denationalises a people as the imposition upon them of a foreign tongue, dominating their life and thought. When Germany, Russia and Austria rent Poland into three fragments, each banned the Polish tongue in the schools and imposed its own. Macaulay, with the most generous feeling and the most utter ignorance, urged the substitution of the English language, literature and civilisation for those which he regarded as heathen and superstitious. The Mother-tongues were despised, and a gulf was dug between the English-educated minority and the learned in the ancient Mother-language and the middle classes educated in tongues derived from it. The free Universities will use the languages of the country throughout all schools and colleges, with English as a second language, and probably other tongues as well. So far, the Universities have given little culture; that has been gained by individuals for themselves. But free Universities will have curricula which shall give both Education and Culture. Students will, as of old, be surrounded with Beauty in the Schools, the Colleges, the Universities.

The second basic difference between the Ancient System and the Modern English one, as imposed on India, is the absence of religious and moral education. In Britain itself, the religion of the country and the morality based on it are taught in the schools as an integral part of education; lately, as Nonconformity

and Free Thought spread, a conscience clause has been introduced exempting children, whose parents objected to the Anglican form of Christianity or to Christianity itself, from compulsory attendance at the religious services and lessons. But when the rule of the East India Company spread, and English Education was introduced into India, the Government schools dropped religious and moral teaching, since, on the one hand, a Christian Government could not teach heathen religions, and, on the other, as there were several religions in India, the Government must treat them all equally, and therefore remain neutral in regard to them. Thus Indians must pay the taxes which keep up Government and other schools, and must further send their children to these, or to Missionary schools where an alien religion is taught, or open their own schools and teach any religion they belong to, Government giving them grants-in-aid.

Modern Education in India has practically confined itself to the training of the mental and intellectual nature, and has ignored the unfolding of the spiritual nature, the evoking and training of the emotional nature, and, until lately, the development and training of the physical body to a high state of efficiency. The result has been, in the older generations, the overstrain of the nervous system, the enfeebling of the physical health, the shortening of the period of vigorous maturity, often a sudden breakdown, or, at best, the premature appearance of debility and old age. Further, the exclusive development of the intelligence and the neglect of the emotions has overstimulated the self-regarding instincts, and has largely destroyed the

feeling of Social and National Dharma, of duty to Society and to the Nation; hence the decay of public spirit, of social service, of responsibility and of sacrifice for the common weal, which characterise the good *citizen* as distinguished from the good *man*. These were prominent in the results of the Ancient System; as Shri Krishna said:

- Janaka and others indeed attained to perfection by action; having an eye to the welfare of the world, thou also shouldst perform action. Whatsoever a great man doeth, that other men also do; the standard he setteth up, by that the people go. . . . As the ignorant act from attachment to action, O Bhārata, so should the wise act without attachment, desiring the welfare of the world . . . He who on earth doth not follow the wheel thus revolving, sinful of life and rejoicing in the senses, he, O Pārtha, liveth in vain.¹

This brings us to a very serious question, which has to be decided before you can settle the grading of your Education and Culture: that which in the West is called "Vocational Education". This is founded on the realisation of the fact that in modern days Society is no longer a cosmos, but has fallen into chaos, into anarchy, and that this disorder must be remedied if modern civilisation is to survive. As Society in the Ancient Indian Ideal was a community of rational beings, not a fortuitous concourse of atoms, it was regarded as an organism, a body politic with definite

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, iii, 20, 21, 25, 16.

organs, each discharging a definite function, for the benefit and health of the whole community. This system was called Caste, and it was necessarily built up by Caste Education. The qualities of each pupil point to his natural avocation in the Nation. The lad who loves the open air and the care of animals, should not be an accountant, or a clerk in a city office. Nor should the quiet youth who seeks study and loves figures be sent off to a farm or a market gardener's. This is recognised in the "learned professions": Law, Medicine, Engineering demand and have separate instruction. A sturdy athletic lad fond of games is not tied down to a stool in a Bank, but is made an Engineer, to plan out railways, or enters some other active occupation. A budding philosopher must not be sent to a factory, nor a poet to a coal-mine. While a general level of Education and Culture should be reached, so that mingling of different types should be useful and agreeable, specialisation is necessary after this is attained. At Takshasilā, it was not thought unreasonable that a poor student with an aptitude for some branch of learning, should meet the cost of his board and lodging by cutting firewood and helping in domestic affairs. In studying he was on equal terms with a student whose father paid one thousand pieces for his education. No student was allowed to have any money, and a King's son was as poor as the son of a Brāhmana peasant. Outcastes, however, were not received, for two Chandālas, who disguised themselves as Brāhmanas but betrayed themselves by coarse language and manners when one of them burned his mouth, were beaten and sent away.

Students there were taught according to their caste. The Brāhmana followed Literature as a rule, while the Kshattriya learned less Literature, but became skilled in the use of arms. Medicine and Surgery and Anatomy were there for the future physician, Mathematics for the astronomer. The courses include so much that to follow them all was manifestly impossible.

As most progressive people, hypnotised by words, object to caste, because it has been abused, if you wish to avoid prejudice, you can drop the word and call it Vocation. But, as Shri Krishna pointed out:

The four castes were emanated by Me, by the different distribution of qualities and action.¹

This is the essence of Caste; the utilisation of physical heredity to provide bodies suitable for the manifestation of the qualities was an advantage, but unessential, and could only be secured by the co-operation of Devas with men, the men following the Dharma laid down for each caste and thus preserving a sub-type of physical body, to which the Devas guided the appropriate egos, i.e. the egos who had evolved the given "distribution of qualities". The group of qualities was that which fitted the ego to discharge one of the functions of one of the fundamental organs of the body politic: Education, spiritual, intellectual, moral, physical; Government; Organisation of Production and Distribution; Production. In each there are many sub-divisions, as Government would include

¹ *Loc. cit.*, iv, 13.

Kings, Assemblies, Judges, Lawyers, Police, etc. These are the predominant and essential groupings of qualities, whether they are called Castes or Vocations. In the Āryan Race, the four great groups were called Castes, and Caste was a scientific system of Social Service according to the inborn qualities of the individual, birth being a convenient, but not essential, concomitant. While it remained on these lines it was honored. It became a matter of National and Social Privileges, and is now therefore resented and, in its present form, it is doomed to disappear. Sub-castes arose sometimes from guilds of artisans, like goldsmiths, who now form a fairly powerful sub-caste in Southern India. Families carrying on the same occupation tended to live together in a particular area in a village, and made a "cheri," of their own. Others arose on religious points, or different customs. But those connected with occupations were the most numerous. Under the Ancient System, youths were trained for their future functions, National and Social, and this is reappearing in the West, as Specialised and Vocational Training, no longer confined to the learned professions, such as Law and Medicine, but extending over all avocations, commercial, trading, industrial and manual, turning the unskilled into the skilled, and thus increasing the value of each to the Nation, each with his own vocation, necessary and honorable, because a function of the organised National life.

It is remarkable that John Ruskin, with his far-reaching vision as artist and poet, as well as Auguste Comte, with his encyclopædic knowledge and keen and lucid intelligence, both recognised the necessity

of rescuing Europe from its anarchic social condition, if it were to survive. John Ruskin, in his *Unto This Last*, says:

Five great intellectual professions, relating to daily necessities of life, have hitherto existed in every civilised Nation:

The Soldier's profession is to *defend* it.

The Pastor's to *teach* it.

The Physician's to *keep it in health*.

The Lawyer's to *enforce justice* in it.

The Merchant's to *provide* for it.

And the duty of all these men is, on due occasion, to *die* for it.

"On due occasion," namely:

The Soldier, rather than leave his post in battle.

The Physician, rather than leave his post in plague.

The Pastor, rather than teach Falsehood.

The Lawyer, rather than countenance Injustice.

The Merchant—what is his "due occasion" of death?

It is the main question for the Merchant, as for all of us. For, truly, the man who does not know how to die, does not know how to live.¹

Ruskin then proceeds to discuss the Ideal Merchant, and, doubtless quiet unconsciously, he describes the Ideal Vaishya. But I must not follow him further on this line, as it would lead me away from Education.

Auguste Comte's classification is not so good, as it is based on a separation of Capital and Labor, and

¹ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 37, 38.

on a rigid barrier of birth instead of on a distribution of qualities.

It is, however, worthy of note that two thinkers, one purely intellectual, the other artistic, should both revert to what is supposed to be an outworn superstition, and that the intuition of the artist has carried him to the truth of the existence of a law of Nature of essential importance to Society, the disregard of which is menacing civilisation. That law unites length of days and general prosperity with the assignment of human beings to the National function for which their qualities fit them. For the proper discharge of that function they must also be fitted by a suitable Education.

India must once more have an Ideal whereby to shape an Education suited to her needs, and to her coming lofty position among the Nations of the world. Can she find a loftier Ideal than that which was her Pole Star in the past, and which preserved her from an antiquity the history of which remains alone in the "Memory of Nature," in the archives of her Rishis, in her own literature, an antiquity which cannot be checked by what is called history, for so far none exists earlier than her own, and archæological researches extend it ever further and further back, and so far tend to confirm her claim to an immense antiquity. All we can say is that history as recognised in Europe, shews nothing contrary to it, and that Europe-recognised history has never known her save as learned, wealthy, prosperous, great in her commerce, her trade, her arts and her crafts, in the magnificence of her courts and the skill of her artificers and her agriculturists,

her people brave and gentle, courteous and hospitable to strangers, until the interlude of which the charter signed by Elizabeth of England was the embryo, and which will close when she is again Mistress in her own household.

I have spoken of the honor paid to Learning in India; whether it was Ancient. Middle or Modern India, whether in the Hindū, Buddhist, or Muslim Period. Learning was sought for its own sake as the mark of the highest human development, that of Man, the Thinker, short only of the supreme achievement of the Parāvidyā, SELF-REALISATION. Even to that, Jñāna was one of the paths, as we shall see tomorrow.

It is worthy of notice that, in India, Education spread downwards; it was not built up from below. Indian Civilisation was a product of the country not of the town, of the forest not of the city. Greek Civilisation evolved in her cities and reached its highest point in the City-State. But as Rabindranath Tagore has said:

A most wonderful thing that we notice in India is that here the forest not the town is the fountain-head of all its civilisation. . . . It is the forest that has nurtured the two great Ancient Ages of India, the Vaidic and the Buddhistic. As did the Vaidic Rishis, Lord Buddha also showered His teaching in many woods of India. The royal palace had no room for Him, it is the forest that took Him into its lap. The current of civilisation that flowed from its forests inundated the whole of India.¹

¹ *Visva-Bhārati Quarterly*, April, 1924, p. 64.

Here is an Indian Ideal that it would be well to revive, for this planting of Universities in the midst of great cities is European, not Indian. Oxford and Cambridge alone in England have kept the tradition of their Āryan forefathers. The modern "Civic Universities," as they are called, are planted in the midst of the most tumultuous, hurrying, noisy cities in England. Not from them will come sublime philosophies or artistic masterpieces; but they will doubtless produce men of inventive genius, miracles of machinery, new ways of annihilating space. But for a country in which a man is valued for what he is, not for what he has, in which a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth, the Indian Ideal is the more suitable. The essence of that Ideal is not the forest as such, but the being in close touch with Nature; to let her harmonies permeate the consciousness, and her calm soothe the restlessness of the mind. Hence, it was the forest, which best suited the type and the object of the instruction in the days which evolved Rishis; instruction which aimed at profound rather than at swift and alert thought; which cared not for lucid exposition by the teacher, but presented to the pupil a kernel of truth in a hard shell, which he must crack unassisted with his own strong teeth if he would enjoy the kernel; if he could not break the shell, he could go without the fruit: instruction which thought less of an accumulation of facts poured out into the pupil's memory than of the drawing out in him the faculty which could discover a truth, hidden beneath a mass of irrelevancies; of such fruitful study the Hindū Āshrama in the forest is the symbol.

It must have a few representatives, at least, in India, if she is to rise to her former level in supreme intellectual and spiritual achievement, some places in which the three Mārgas may be taught and Yoga may be practised, until the Yogī is fit, as of old, to go out into the world of human activity, as the wise man who lives that which the *Bhagavad-Gītā* teaches. This was learnt by some of the adults in the Āshrama and the Vihāra, where also under the then conditions the youth of the Nation could be trained in any of the Vijjas (branches of learning) and the Shilpas (Arts and Crafts) without sharing in the studies of the elders and the ascetics, yet sharing in the atmosphere they created, which radiated from them. A few "forests" should exist in India, for those who seek the Parāvidyā, that She may again become the spiritual Teacher of the World.

The Buddhist Vihāra obtained similar results by founding the University in a spot of natural beauty, and enclosing a huge space with a high wall, pierced as in Nālandā with but one gate, in Vikramasīla by six, in all cases carefully guarded by a Dvāra Pandita. Within were not only splendid buildings—"Towers, domes and pavilions stood amidst a paradise of trees, gardens and fountains." There were flower-strewn lakes and blossom-laden shrubs. Well was understood the influence of natural beauty. The sacred books of Hindūs and Buddhists were studied; the curriculum included anatomy and medicine, and it will be remembered that Ashoka in the third century B.C., established hospitals both for men and animals, and Mr. Dutt speaks of these being "established all over

the country". One list of the subjects studied gives the five Siddhāntas, Logic, Grammar, Philosophy and Metaphysics, History, Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, Samskrit, Pāli, Music and Tāntric medicine. Dr. Macdonnell states that in Science, Phonetics, Grammar, Mathematics, Anatomy, Medicine and Law, the attainment of Indians was far in advance of what was achieved by the Greeks.

In the *Chhāndogyopanishat* we read how Nārada resorted to the Lord Sanat Kumāra, and prayed to be instructed by Him, and He asked what he knew already. And Nārada gives a list which reminds one of the curricula of the Universities which we know, and which evidently existed in the Ancient Hindū Age. For Nārada replied:

O Lord, I have read the Rig Veda, the Yajur Veda, the Sāma Veda, fourth the Atharva Veda, fifth the Ithihāsa and Purāna, Grammar, Rituals, the Science of Numbers, Physics, Chronology, Logic, Polity, Technology, the Sciences cognate to the Vedas, the Science of Bhūtas, Archery, Astronomy, the Science of Antidotes, and the fine arts. [Shankara annotates the last as the Science of making essences, of dancing, singing, music, architecture, painting, etc. (Shilpa)] Unto him said Sanat Kumāra: "All these that you have learned are merely nominal."

And then He leads him on step by step.

Thus "did the Lord Sanat Kumāra explain what is beyond darkness".¹

¹ *Loc. cit.*, VII, i, 1-3; xxvi, 2.

The lists given may avail to shew why men remained in the forest, or in a monastery which was also a University for youth, into quite late maturity.

During the whole course in school as in college, strict Brahmacharya was enjoined. Here, again, is an Ideal which must be restored. The rule of Manu for the student was strictly observed: simple dress, plain food, hard bed, the vow of the Brahmachāri. There were no exceptions, prince, noble, commoner, all were treated alike. Not in Ancient, as in Modern, India were young princes allowed to live softly, luxuriously, and they lived to a healthy old age. Now, we have boys at school who are fathers, and the seeds are sown of premature old age.

Nor must we forget how the lack of Brahmacharya in the student reacts on the child wife. Happily now young men are demanding educated brides, and hence the period of Education is being prolonged. I am not going to argue as to the orthodox view of pre-puberty marriage: Pandits find texts for and against; but this I say: if you will look at the registered death rates at different ages, you will find that the curve of the death rate of married girls shoots up suddenly at the age of 15; silent but terrible witness to the superstition which cuts short the thread of girl-life, and sacrifices the fairest and sweetest women in the world on the altar of child-marriage.

I have not found in connection with the Buddhist Universities the same attention to physical exercises as one reads in the *Jātakas* in relation to Takshasilā. There students practised archery, the use of the sword and the javelin, and there were military, medical and

law schools. We read also that young nobles, trained in Arts and Crafts, used to visit on their travels, after leaving the University, artists and craftsmen, and see that a high level was maintained. Thus the University re-acted on the villages, and preserved the artistic capacities and traditions of the people.

In the Muslim Period, there was a remarkable development of Architecture, an art in which the Musalmāns excelled, as Arabia, Spain and India testify. The courts of the Musalmān Rulers were sanctuaries of learned men, of painters, poets and musicians. Their use of jewels in architecture was extraordinarily skilful, giving richness without being meretricious. As with the Hindūs and their temples, schools were attached to the Musjids, giving primary education, while Madrasahs afforded the higher education. Whether in Hinduism, Buddhism or Islām we find a similar care for Vocational Education among the higher social classes, supplying the Nation with the professions necessary for the healthy functioning of the National Life, maintaining the high level of Literature and the Arts, as well as the training of the statesman, the Minister, the military and civil organisation and administration. The manual labor classes were equally well provided for by general instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, accountancy, and careful training in the simple and more artistic crafts, the first for home use, the second for sale to local and export merchants. The teaching of religion and morality was universal, and much was done for the adult culture of villagers by the wandering Sannyāsīs who travelled on foot from village to village, and in the evenings related

stories from the sacred books and chanted stotras and legends.

Taking a bird's-eye view, we may perhaps say that the Āshramas were dominated by Philosophy and Metaphysics, while not neglecting the Sciences and the Arts; the Vihāras, were dominated by Science, while again not neglecting Philosophy and Arts; the Madrasahs were dominated by Art, with a divided allegiance to Science. Such classifications are, however, somewhat arbitrary, and all poured rich knowledge into the national life. To the people all were closely related, for they spread that love and reverence for Learning which shed abroad, by the stimulating force of example, the superiority of Learning to Wealth, the value of Voluntary Poverty and of Sacrifice consecrated to Social Service, a Social Order which conduced to mutual usefulness, and a Beauty which, as in Japan today, is said by Mr. E. B. Havell to be "not a luxury for the rich, but the basis of National Education". He goes on:

Poetry has done as much for National Culture in Japan as it did formerly in Greece, and, until the nineteenth century, in India also. Poetical tournaments are still a favorite form of popular entertainment in Japan, and even among the poorest classes any occasion of domestic importance, either joyful or sad, is marked by poems composed by the people themselves. In the spring mornings in Japan the working classes, the poorest of the poor, and not only the well-to-do, will rise by hundreds to watch the opening of the lotus flowers; the flowering of the

plum and cherry trees in the early summer are days of national rejoicing. India need not cease to take delight in Beauty, and to have faith in the inspiration of Nature which her ancient Rishis taught, because she has become poor. It is far worse to be poor in spirit than to be poor in worldly goods. Modern science and English education are not sufficient substitutes for Art. It will not profit India to gain the whole world and lose her own soul.¹

The disappearance of Indian Ideals was as sudden as it was disastrous; invasions and even the establishment of a foreign Empire and foreign kingdoms previous to the invasion and triumph of the East India Company in 1757, had not touched the Soul or the Spirit of India. She had been invaded but she had assimilated the invaders and had enriched her own Culture by theirs.

Portions of her land had been conquered and occupied, but she turned the conquerors into Indians. But the East India Company not only drained her of her accumulated wealth and reduced her to poverty, but despised her Learning and her Art, crushed her with ignorance, and filled the palaces of her Princes with Brummagen imitations and glass-legged sofas and chairs. It destroyed her self-respect and jeered at her religion and her traditions. It consummated her degradation by imposing on her an Education in a foreign language, till her educated people talked it better than their Mother-tongue. Having destroyed

¹ *Artistic and Industrial Revival in India*, by E. B. Havell, pp. 65, 66.

the Schools which had given it clerks and accountants, it wanted English-knowing men to fill the lower ranks of its administration, so introduced its new system. It got them, but the corollaries thereof were unexpected and disconcerting. It taught them English history and they became interested in English struggles for Liberty. It gave them the masterpieces of English Literature, and they studied Milton's *Areopagitica*, and declaimed Shelley's *Masque of Anarchy*. They admired the Ideals held up, and desired to find Liberty among the "blessings of British Rule". They found it not, and thirty years after the introduction of Sir Charles Wood's educational measure, they met in Madras and decided to create an Indian National Congress.

Forty years later, having revived Indian religions and started Muslimān and Hindū colleges and schools, and having meanwhile studied Indian history and assimilated its lessons, we have resolved to revive the Ancient Ideals of Indian Education and Indian Culture, to teach our children in their Mother-tongue, to make Indian Ideals the basis of Indian Civilisation, renouncing the hybrid and sterile ideals of anglicised-Indianism, and to adapt them to a new form, instinct with the Ancient Life, and moulding it into a glorious new body for the Ancient Spirit. India will then lead the world into a new era of Literature and Beauty, Brotherhood and Peace.

II. PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

"CANST thou by searching find out God?" asked Zophar of Job, and human intellect, age after age, has answered: "I will try." Many have thus striven, and ever they have failed. "Love of Wisdom" is the literal meaning of the word, Philosophy, but that only throws us back on the meaning of Wisdom. Again many have defined its meaning, and of these, two definitions stand out prominently: that of Plato, who defined the Philosopher as one who is capable of grasping the Eternal and the Changeless, and of Aristotle, who considered it to be essentially a search into the nature of existence. Another way of looking at it is by contrasting it with Science, and saying that Science explains the "How" of Nature, while Philosophy seeks to discover the "Why". Using the Indian psychology we might call Science the study by the Lower Manas—Consciousness in the Manomaya-kosha—of the events, the happenings, the facts of Nature, and their inter-relations and inter-play; while Manas, Consciousness in the Vijñānamayakosha, studies abstract truths, abstract ideas, first principles, the causes of which Science studies the effects. Science studies phenomena, appearances, the details of the Unreal; Philosophy seeks to comprehend Noumena in the hope to grasp the Noumenon, the Real, which ceaselessly hides itself behind the ever-changing unrealities.

Religion is, essentially, the search for, the cry of Spirit by the fragment that is the Spirit in man for the whole Spirit, the unsatisfied craving of the part for completeness, the pressure against the limitations of Time and Space by the Eternal and the Spaceless.

Spinoza's view that Philosophy has to do only with Knowledge, with opinions, with the things of the mind, and Religion exclusively with obedience and ethics, seems rather to have been framed to meet the exigencies of a persecuting age, than to any deeper view of the content of each. He had a desperate need for complete freedom of thought and word, and this could only be secured if Philosophy had nothing to do with Religion. If the two were related, he was in imminent peril of life. The religions of the world are the partial answers of the Hidden Love to His lovers, that attraction of matter to matter, of Spirit to Spirit, that holds the planets in their orbits round the Sun, and causes the many Selves from every side to approach the One SELF. It is the attraction of Knowledge to the incomplete knower, the attraction of Union to the separated. The instrument of the Jñānī is Meditation, and his object Truth. The instrument of the Yogī is Love, or Action which is sacrifice, and his object Union. But the object is really the same, SELF-Realisation; as Shri Krishna says: "That place which is gained by the Sāmkhyas is gained by the Yogīs also,"¹ though the one fixes his thought on Brahman in His aspect of Truth, and the other on Brahman in His aspect of Bliss. "In the heart of him who is perfectly devoted, Wisdom springeth up in process of time."

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, v, 5.

Or again:

Verily there is no purifier in the world like Wisdom; he that is perfected in Yoga, finds it in the Self in due season.¹

And this is evidently necessary, lest he should mistake the unreal for the Real, for he needs Viveka. Now the Jñāni will not reach his goal, unless he loves as well as knows; nor will the Yogī reach it without Knowledge, for it is written that "the SELF cannot be attained . . . by devotion, nor by knowledge which is unattended by devotion".² For knowledge alone tends to separation, while Love unites. Or again: "The SELF cannot be gained by knowledge, nor by understanding, nor by manifold science. He can be gained by the Self by whom He is desired. His SELF reveals His own truth."³

The reason for this is not far to seek. For the Realisation of the SELF is Wisdom.

Constancy in the Wisdom of the SELF, understanding of the Object of essential Wisdom; that is declared to be the Wisdom; all against it is ignorance.⁴

If Knowledge must be wedded to Devotion ere SELF-Realisation can be gained, it is because Knowledge and Love together are Wisdom. In the relation of

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, iv, 38.

² *Mundakop.*, III, ii, 4.

³ *Kathop.*, I, ii, 23.

⁴ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, xiii, 12.

the subtle worlds to each other, the world of the emotions is related to the super-mānasic, not to the world of Manas, next to it in order of matter. As Bergson has pointed out, Intuition, the next stage to Intellect in human evolution, is related to instinct, not to reasoning; Intellect looks outwards; instinct is a non-mental impulse to action, below mind, and lessens as mind increases as the guide of activity; intuition acts within from life to life, in the Ānandamayakosha, for life is One, and realises its unity in that subtle sheath of matter; the wall of separation, the Vijñānamaya-kosha, dissolves in the union with Buddhi, colors, as it were, the life which is Buddhi with the resultant of its myriad incarnations, and the Spiritual Individual is born: the first stage of the infolding of the Ātma-Buddhi-Manas into the triple-aspected Ātmā. Until that has been experienced, Nirvāna cannot be entered, and through its realisation slowly accomplished, Liberation is achieved. The steps in the awakening of Buddhi, or rather in the responsiveness of the Ānandamayakosha to any vibration coming to it from the lower world, is part of the practice of Yoga, and will be mentioned in its proper place.

Moreover:

Whoever has not ceased from evil ways, is not subdued, not concentrated and subdued in mind, doth not obtain Him, not even by knowledge.¹

Here we touch on a profound difference between Indian and European Ideals as to Knowledge. In

¹ *Kathop.*, I, ii, 24.

Europe, Knowledge is divorced from Ethics, as we have seen that Spinoza, driven by cruel circumstances, demanded. And it is only fair to recognise that Knowledge—whether to be gained as Philosophy by the Intellect, or that part of it gained by the study of external Nature by the concrete mind, known as Science—was in chains during the Middle Ages in Europe, except among the Moors in Spain. To reconcile the dogmas of the Church with the discoveries made by the students of Nature was impossible, and men paid their lives as the price of their advancing Knowledge. Giordano Bruno paid the price of his ascertions as to Nature in the torture-prisons of Venice and of Rome, and at the stake in the Field of Flowers; Galileo paid it in the prisons of the Inquisition, and in the denial—when worn out by age and pain—of the truth he knew. Never let us forget that it was the enforcement of religious dogmas that began in Europe the “conflict between Religion and Science,” and that allowance must be made for that, when we find the lamentable conflict of today between Science, in the plenitude of its power, trampling on the Ethic which is common to all religions.

Science will state that discoveries, say in chemistry and physics, may be equally well made by a bad man as by a good one; and that is true within certain limits, just as with other activities in the physical world; my eyesight is not necessarily seriously injured, because I have lost my hearing; laws work within their own conditions; a man may be an indifferent father or husband, and may yet be a clever discoverer of some of Nature's secrets; Roger Bacon's virtue did not

prevent him from being maimed by explosions, when he brought together substances which, under certain conditions, would cause an explosion. The laws of physical Nature work without deviation, whether a virtuous or a vicious man sets them going. But neither his virtue nor his vice must injure his physical health; he must not lessen his keenness of sight, his delicacy of touch by his vices; but he may be jealous, mean, unkind, until these injure his physical body, as they do after a time.

But there are spheres in which the "Power that makes for righteousness," in which God's Plan, which is evolution towards higher and higher states of being, cannot be defied with impunity; the Will of the Whole, which, so far as we in this world are concerned, is the Will of our Ishvara, the Lord of our Solar System, cannot be frustrated by the fragment of Him, the Spirit in man.

Though the mills of God grind slowly,
Yet He grinds exceeding small;
Though He stands and waits with patience,
With Exactness grinds He all.

Science, in the West, has taken the wrong path in the scientific exploration of the bodies of living animals, in order to wrench, out of their torture and agony, cures for the diseases brought to Nations by their disregard of the laws of Nature on healthy living. Sympathy with suffering, tenderness to all that lives, protection of the weak from the aggression of the strong, all that makes us human and that creates

Society, is set at naught, is scoffed at as foolish sentimentality, over the operating boards and the torture troughs of the vivisector. From the animals, the brutal inquisition has made its way into the hospitals, and patients approaching death are further tortured by the injection of some other disease, as may be read in the medical journals of Germany and Austria. From that the scientific discoverer, seared to human feelings, turns his inventive faculty to the devising of more deadly explosives, more torturing gases, more widely-spreading agencies of death, for the destruction of human bodies and the brutalising of human emotions. Science, which should be the Nourisher, the Healer, the Preserver, the Helper of Humanity, becomes a frightful Gorgon, whose eyes petrify the human heart. At last, Nature is turning on her desecrators, and is making, by their work, new diseases of the body, as well as the destroying of the soul. This distortion of Science has turned Europe into a shambles, and threatens to engulf it in the abyss that has swallowed up the civilisations of the Past. From that ruin of the Āryans may India be saved by her Ideals.

For the Indian Ideals of Philosophy was not divorced from her Ideals of Religion. Therefore was it taught, as we have seen, that the Supreme Goal could not be reached by any who had not ceased from evil ways. Read the list of the Divine qualities given in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, Adhyāya xvi, and then learn the qualities demanded by that arduous task.

I have suggested in the Synopsis that the Supreme value of the Hindū Philosophy and Religion is that they meet every human need, so vast is their scope;

and yet is their adaptation to the needs of man, perfect straining to the utmost the intellect of the strongest thinker, and yet offering to the least intelligent an object of devotion that inspires him and satisfies his emotions, while yet he knows that the Image, the Tree, is not God but a symbol of God because the Life of God is in it, as that Life is in himself, as in the Devas (the Shining Ones—the Angels of the Christian and the Muslim) who are dear to us because we share the One Life, and can co-operate with each other just because we are akin by that sharing. We shall see in a moment that all the grades of existence, all lives, live in and by the One Life. Each man worships the highest Idea of God that he can reach by the straining of the mind, by the upsoaring of the heart, and he imposes on it the limitations of his own thought and love, with a halo of vagueness which means to him infinity. But, as from an aeroplane, rising high in air, we look down upon a great city with palaces, and temples, and lofty monuments, and poor men's huts, and see them all flattened into almost a level, so are men and their ideas of God. The astronomer tells us of innumerable Universes, tells us how our Sun and all his system circle round another greater Sun, forming part of his system and so on and on, and we can neither conceive an end to it, with nothing beyond, nor an endlessness to it, for we only think by limitations; the peasant who knows only a village, to whom a town, a district, a country, a continent, a world, are all vague words, with little or no content, has only a narrower limit than our own. Beyond the limit of comprehension, we all babble empty sounds

devoid of meaning; we are all futile and childish when we strive to measure with our tape-lengths that Infinite Life. Wiser and better is the Hindū statement: when reaching the limit of thought, he says that "Beyond is Darkness"; words fail; silence alone is rational. The limit differs for each of us; yet let us soar as high as we can; no limit is imposed on us. Mighty Beings we pass in thought as we soar, and we murmur: "Neti, Neti." Darkness surrounds us; in some future we may pierce a little further. What then? There is ever a Beyond.

I do not know whether any Philosophy, except the Hindū, has the object of putting an end to pain by the reaching of Brahman, who is Bliss. Says the *Shvetāshvataropaniṣat*:

Until man is able to roll up the ether as leather, there will be no end to misery except through the knowledge of God.¹

So again, Shri Krishna teaches:

That should be known by the name of Yoga, this disconnection from the union with pain.²

And again:

Supreme joy is for this Yogī whose mind is peaceful, whose passion-nature is calmed, who is sinless and of the nature of the Eternal.³

Only by SELF-Realisation can a man achieve the certainty that he himself is of "the nature of the

¹ *Shvetāshvatarop.*, vi, 20.

² *Bhagavad-Gītā*, vi, 23.

³ *Ibid.*, 27.

Eternal"—that supreme triumph of the Hindū Philosophy. The Parāvidyā, the "Supreme Wisdom," is the central truth of the Upanishats. It is the Identity of the Universal and the Particular SELF. "Tat Tvam Asi," "THAT thou art." Such is the final truth; such the goal of all Wisdom, of all Devotion, of all Right Activity. THAT thou art. Nothing less than that is the wisdom of the Upanishats; nothing more than that—for more than that there is not. That is the last truth of all truths; that the final experience of all experiences. And that is implied, as we shall see presently, as we realise the meaning of another sentence of three words: "Brahman is all."

The knowledge of Brahman as Bliss is the only "end to misery". A remarkable passage in the *Taittiriyaopanishat*, starts from depicting the joy of a man, a youth to whom the whole world is full of wealth, and who is firm, strong and well-disciplined; then this joy of man, multiplied a hundredfold is one joy of a Gandharva, and this is multiplied a hundredfold and so on successively through a long list of greater and greater joys in geometrical progression, and at last reaches Brahman, who "consists of Bliss," "from whom all words return together with the mind, without having comprehended Him".¹

Never yet has been broken

The Silence eternal:

Never yet has been spoken

In accents supernal,

God's Thought of Himself.

¹ *Loc. cit.*, ii, 8th and 9th Anuvāka.

We are groping in blindness,
Who yearn to behold Him:
But in wisdom and kindness
In Darkness He folds Him,
Till the Soul learns to see.

So the veil is unriven
That hides the all-Holy;
So no token is given
That satisfies wholly
The cravings of man.

But, unhasting, advances
The march of the ages;
To Truth-seekers' glances
Unrolling the pages
Of God's revelation.

Impatience unheeding,
Time, slowly revolving,
Unresting, unspeeding,
Is ever evolving
Fresh truths about God.

Human speech has not broken
The stillness supernal.
Yet ever is spoken
Through Silence eternal,
With growing distinctness,
God's Thought of Himself.

Personally, I regard the Upanishats as the highest product of the human mind, the crystallised wisdom of divinely illuminated men. Eighteen years ago I read in *The Hibbert Journal* an article entitled, "The Vital Value of the Hindū God Idea," that brings out very forcibly the fact that its value consists in the recognition that since "Brahman is *all*," there is only one Consciousness, and that is God-Consciousness. The unfolding of Consciousness in any being is the unfolding of the God-Consciousness in him. The writer puts this very clearly:

To the educated Hindū, the most significant attribute of self-conscious beings is their subjectivity. He habitually maintains that the idea of God is always presented to the mind in the very same act as the idea of self. Plainly, the inference here is that God is to be found, not by means of any objective use of the mind: not by the ontological, nor the cosmological, nor the biological argument, but by penetrating all the mental strata with which mankind's civilising processes have overlaid man's diviner nature.¹

There is nothing at all save Brahman. Childish questions, as to "Is there a God?" or "Why did God make a universe?" are seen to be idle and useless. All, everything, is but a manifestation of Brahman. There is no creation, only modelling anew; nothing "less" at one time, nothing more at another; Brahman ever is; He is Real, and "the Real never ceaseth to

¹ *Loc. cit.*, October, 1906.

be".¹ Brahman manifests fragments of Himself, as Universes, and ever remains transcendent. He breathes them out, He breathes them in; but there is no addition to, no diminution of, existence. There is naught but He. There is only He, He, "whose one sure proof is the SELF". Your SELF; my SELF; the one certainty we possess, which no proof can add to, which no proof can take away. And in affirming your own existence, you affirm that Brahman *is*: "Thou art THAT." None can make this a vital truth to you, save yourself. I will try, in speaking presently of Yoga to you, to point you to the Ancient, Narrow Way, the Path which is "narrow as the edge of a razor"; but no one can tread it for you, nor for you achieve SELF-Realisation; each must tread it for himself, but he who seeks, shall find.

Let me put it to you here in words which I have spoken elsewhere, but which, unfortunately, I am not able to improve, so use them here.

This Truth—Brahman is All—is the Magna Carta of intellectual freedom. Let a man think; let a man speak. Never mind if he makes errors; further knowledge will lead him right. He cannot wander outside the SELF, for the SELF is everywhere. He cannot lose the SELF, for the SELF is within him. Let the intellect soar as it will, upwards and upwards as far as its wings can beat; still far beyond its powers, far across its piercing, North and South and East and West and Zenith and Nadir, Brahman stretches everywhere, the illimitable SELF. Intellect cannot go outside the SELF, of which it is a manifestation; it cannot therefore shake the eternal certainty of SELF-existence.

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, ii, 16.

It is this, the central Truth of the Upanishats, of which you and I should strive in these brief moments to glimpse something, though very little; something we are to learn of this all-pervading Truth; a Truth which cannot dazzle us, however radiant, however brilliant, however glorious, for we are of its nature, we are its rays, its light is ours. Is it not then fitting that we should try to train our minds into harmony with this one Truth, and pray that that "Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"¹ may shine from within us and without us, that we too may see?

"O Pūshan, O All-Sustainer, open thou the mouth of Truth, now hidden by a golden veil, that we, the votaries of Truth, may see."²

Perhaps the best simile would be to take your own mind, and to think of the thoughts that arise in it as a manifested Universe in Brahman, the All. In the mind all its thoughts are contained; from it they are born, and into it they vanish. In Brahman, Universes arise in endless succession, a chain that has no beginning and no end. Unchangeable, because all-inclusive; everything is therein, literally everything; all that ever was in the past, all that is in the present, all that shall be in the future, all that is conceivable, all that is imaginable, everything which can be, resides in that immeasurable All; there is nothing else. Absolute, because there is nothing else with which THAT can be in relation. There *is* nothing else but Brahman. Out of that immeasurable fullness, as waves out of an ocean, Universes arise: and as

¹ *S. John*, i, 9.

² *Bṛihadāraṇyakop.*, V, xv, 1.

waves smooth down again into the ocean, Universes disappear. All that has been, that is, is ever there, in unchangeable reality of life. All that ever may be sleeps therein, in that boundless bosom of universal Fatherhood. There is naught else. Everything is there in one simultaneous unchangeable reality of ever-present living. And so the wise have said that all opposites are therein, in order to force the human mind to realise that nothing is left out, that there is naught outside THAT, that there is nothing else. You cannot speak of a Universe as being made, as though it had not ever been, for all is in THAT, which changes not. All opposites find therein their reconciliation, their mutual destruction; all opposites there merge into each other, for THAT is all, and there is none other.

Think it over, till the mind grows dizzy. Think it over, till some effect of immensity is felt. All that is, is but the fullness of the ever-upwelling manifestation of existence. And remember THAT ever *is*; it does not *become*. Universes become. They are born forth, but that ETERNAL is One Unchangeable; THAT knows no present, no past, no future, for All Is, and All is Brahman. Let the depth and the splendour of that thought dwell in the mind till it becomes part of your veriest SELF, and you can think of nothing as outside THAT which is.

How then may we speak of Him? How may we express Him? How may we define Him? THAT who is everything, without parts, indivisible, non-existence giving forth existence? "Thither the eye goeth not, the voice goeth not, nor mind. We know not, nor distinguish, how THAT may be thought. Different

indeed THAT from the known, beyond the unknown. Thus have we heard from the Elders. they who instruct us. That who existeth not by the voice, but THAT by whom the voice existeth, THAT know thou as Brahman, not this which is worshipped as this. THAT who thinketh not with the mind, but by whom the mind thinketh, THAT know thou as Brahman, not this which is worshipped as this. THAT who seeth not by the eye, but by whom the eye seeth, THAT know thou as Brahman, not this which is worshipped as this..¹ THAT who heareth not by the ear, but by whom the ear heareth, THAT know thou as Brahman, not this which is worshipped as this. THAT who liveth not by the life, but by whom the life liveth, THAT know thou as Brahman, not this which is worshipped as this."¹

It is the Self who

sees, unseen; hears, unheard; minds, unminded; unknown, knows. "There is none that sees, but He. There is none that hears, but He. There is none that minds, but He. There is none that knows, but He. He is thy SELF, the inner Ruler, immortal!"²

Hence the advice:

"Let not a man wish to know speech, let him know the speaker. Let not a man wish to know smell, let him know the smeller. Let not a man wish

¹ *Kenop.*, i, 3-8.

² *Brihadār.*, III, vii, 23.

to know form, let him know the seer. Let not a man wish to know sound, let him know the hearer . . . Let not a man wish to know the mind, let him know the thinker." (The SELF) "is the Owner of the world, the King of the world, the Lord of the world; this is my SELF. Thus let a man know."¹

For is not this reasonable? What is the good of knowing the objects only, if THAT which knows them is within us? They become secondary, trivial, foolish. It is the SELF who possesses all the powers, who we should truly desire to know.

Again:

By Him, than whom nothing is greater, than whom nothing is subtler nor older, who stands unshaken in the heavens like a tree, the One, the Spirit, all this is pervaded.²

If we turn to the discourse of Yama to Nachiketas, we find him explaining the many forms of the Self: It is the SELF that,

as Sun dwells in the heaven, as wind in the atmosphere, as fire in the earth; He dwells in man, in ether, in water, is born in earth, in sacrifice, in the mountains; . . . He is truth, the great One. The One SELF . . . is the inner SELF of all beings.³

¹ *Kaushītakabrāhmaṇa*, iii, 8.

² *Shvetāshvatara*, iii, 9.

³ *Kathop.*, v, 2, 9.

He the One, the Lord, who makes one nature manifold, is the inner SELF of all beings.

And so again the *Mundakopanishat* repeats the same wondrous story:

From this are born breath, mind, all the senses, ether, air, light, water, earth, the support of all. From Him the fire whose fuel is the Sun, from Him the Moon, from Him Devas, men, quadrupeds, birds, the vital airs, the seven senses, the seven fires, the seven channels in which the vital airs move, that sleeps in the cavity of the heart, from Him all seas and mountains, all rivers and herbs. "Thou art woman, Thou art man, Thou art virgin youth, and maiden. Thou the outworn, tottering with his staff. Thou art born, thy Face the Universe." ¹

Hindū Philosophy, having thus recognised the One, turns to the understanding of the Many. "He who sees the ONE amid the Many," says Plato, "him I consider as a God." Let us then turn fearlessly to learn how from the grandiose idea of the ONE, we can find our way to an understanding of the Many; and here I crave permission, as it will tend to clarity of sequential thought, to transfer to this point two terms in my Synopsis—Nirguna Brahman and Saguna Brahman. Nirguna Brahman is the ONE, without the gunas, THAT to whom we have striven vainly to raise our thought. Saguna Brahman is still the ONE, but with the gunas, the beginning of SELF-manifestation.

¹ Summarised from the *Mundakop.*, II, i, 2-9.

the qualities of Prakriti, Matter. The *Taittareya Upanishat* speaks of Saguna Brahman as the embodied SELF of Nirguna Brahman: "He, verily, is the embodied SELF of THAT."¹ Shri Krishna makes this difficult matter clearer, when He speaks of Prakriti, matter, and of Daivī Prakriti, divine substance; the manifested multitude of beings are Prākritic; Daivī Prakriti is His unmanifested Body, and from it the Prākritic beings stream forth and to it they return. But

Verily there existeth higher than that unmanifested, another unmanifested, eternal—²

the Saguna Brahman, by whom all This—the Universe—is pervaded, of whom all Universes are manifested fragments. As Brahman is spoken of as THAT, so is a fragment spoken of as THIS, and the *Chhāndogyopanishat* says:

All THIS verily is Brahman, for thereform is it born, there into is it dissolved, and thereby it is maintained.³

All THIS is Brahman, not a second, not another. Brahman unmanifested, Brahman manifested is ONE. "When He is manifest, all is manifested after Him. By His manifestation this whole becomes manifest."⁴

For the attributes of Brahman in Life-manifestation, Sat-Chit-Ānanda, with the three gunas of His Prākritic

¹ *Loc. cit.*, II, vi, 1.

² *Bhagavad-Gītā*, viii, 18-20.

³ *Chhāndogyop.*, III, xiv, 1.

⁴ *Mundakop.*, II, ii, 10.

manifestation, Tamas, resistance, Rajas, Mobility, and Sattva, Rhythm (Vibration) the double triplicity of Life and Matter, appears in all manifestations. From the Saguna Brahman came forth three primary Elements, Heat, from which was born Water, and from Water, Earth.¹ The manifested fragments of the One were called Brahmāndas, Eggs of Brahman. "Existence (Saguna Brahman) became an Egg."²

- Know that of such eggs there are thousands of billions . . . They exist upwards and downwards, horizontally, and in every one of them are Brahmās, Haris, Bhavas.³

These are Universes, peopled with Jivātmās. For we learn that the Lord of Universe, Ishvara, entered into these Elements in the form of Jivātmā, and thus became "manifest in various names and forms," and each Element became a ternary, like the entering Life.⁴ Brahman, then, in "name and form" (akāsha) is the Jivātmā and is spoken of as the ether which is outside man, and is verily that ether which is within man (antarākāsha).⁵ Using other terms, the Monad (Jivātmā) is a fragment of the Supreme, derived through our Ishvara; he sends out a stream of His triadic Life into matter denser than that of his birth-place, above the fivefold universe, and that Life appropriates some

¹ *Chhāndogyop.*, VI, ii, 3, 4.

² *Ibid.*, III, xix, 1.

³ *Vāyu Samhitā*, viii, 10.

⁴ *Chhāndogyop.*, VI, iii, 2-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII, i, 1; compare with VIII, xiv, 1.

of its highest matter, and appears therein as the triple Ātmā, unfolding into Ātma-Buddhi-Manas, the Monad remaining in his own divine world raying out a stream of life, the Pilgrim Soul, the higher Triad which is Man, who enters on the Path of Forth-going, to tread later the Path of Return.

The *Mundakopanishat* puts this vividly, stressing the identity between Brahman and the Jīvātmā.

As from a flaming fire in a thousand directions bodies of like nature as sparks proceed; so, O Beloved, from the Eternal are born beings, who also return thither.¹

The Upanishat goes on to enumerate the various embodied lives—Devas, Sandhyas, men, quadrupeds, birds, etc., and seas, mountains, and rivers, all inhabited by the same Life.

In Hindū Philosophy, an attempt is made to indicate ideas that are just beyond the reach of the mind by a use of combinations of letters to express sounds that cause vibrations in the air and then affect the ether, and that in turn the world of the subtle body, the Sūkshma Sharīra. The idea is not what the West would call unscientific, but it is only beyond science, because it deals with states of matter which Western Science does not yet contact. The *Chhāndogyopanishat*, as you know, has a number of these letter combinations. There is one, however, familiar to every Hindū as the Sacred Word, the Pranava, and it may be mentioned here in passing. The word may be uttered

¹ *Mundakop.*, II, i, 1.

as a single sound OM. But the O is a combination of A and U; therefore it can also be sounded as a triple, a three-lettered sound, AUM. In the first, it symbolises the Nirguna Brahman, Brahman Unmanifest; in the second, the Saguna Brahman, Brahman manifested with the three qualities Sat-Chit-Ānanda. There is the hidden SELF, the higher unmanifested, formless, immortal, stable, beyond, the letter A of the Pranava. There is a manifestation that we see around us, the second body of Saguna Brahman, the formed, the mortal, the unstable, the manifest—the letter M—and between those two, the link which joins them, the lower unmanifested, the loftier body, the Daivī Prakriti, the Relation between Spirit and Matter, between Immortal and mortal, between Changeless and changing, which makes possible this universe; and that remains as constant as the Universe, for without it, the Universe cannot be. That is the second letter of the three-syllabled AUM, the U, which creates and destroys, the first embodiment of the SELF, the Relation established by His Thought between Himself and Māyā. And so again it is written:

Perishable, the worldstuff (Pradhāna), imperishable, immortal, is Hara. He, the one God, rules the perishable and the SELF.¹

There is an interesting remark on this in the *Māndūkyopanishat*, in which the three states of consciousness are described and compared with the three-lettered AUM and the fourth state is said to be

¹ *Shvetāshvatara*, i, 10.

Him whose knowledge are not external objects nor internal, nor both; . . . who is invisible, imperceptible, unseizable, incapable of proof, beyond thought, not to be defined, whose only proof is the belief in the SELF, in whom all the spheres have ceased, who is tranquil, blissful and without duality.¹

This is the SELF, the OM pronounced as one syllable, the OM which is

partless, actionless, manifestation at rest, blissful, without duality. The OM thus is the SELF alone.²

I shall have to refer to this when I come to Yoga, in connection with the three states of Consciousness, Jāgrat, Svapna and Sushupti.

It may here be noted that in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* Shri Krishna reveals Himself to Arjuna in His Divine Form, wherein Arjuna sees all forms, "all grades of beings," "in wondering multitudes," and is bewildered by His "forth-streaming life," declaring: "In Thy vast form the universe is spread."³

Remembering the fundamental fact of this identity of the Nirguna Brahman, the Saguna Brahman, and the Jivātmās, in nature, while differing in conditions, you will realise that any Rational Philosophy must be Pantheistic in its character; one of the most powerful books with which I am acquainted on this subject is Dean Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought*, the

¹ *Loc. cit.*, 7.

² *Loc. cit.*, 12.

³ *Loc. cit.*, xi, *passim*.

Bampton Lectures for 1867. The following analysis of it occurs in an essay of my own, *On the Nature and Existence of God*, written in 1874 after much searching of heart, in answer to the question "what do you believe in regard to God?" There were two orthodox parties: one held that the existence of God could be demonstrated, the second that it could not, but must be accepted on the authority of a revelation.

The best representation I can select of the second orthodox party, those who admit that the existence of God is not demonstrable, is the late Dean Mansel. In his *Limits of Religious Thought*, the Bampton Lectures, 1867, he takes up a perfectly unassailable position. The peculiarity of this position, however, is that he, the pillar of orthodoxy, the famed defender of the faith against German infidelity and all forms of rationalism, regards God from exactly the same point as does a well-known modern "Atheist". I have almost hesitated sometimes which writer to quote from, so identical are they in thought. Probably neither Dean Mansel nor Mr. Bradlaugh would thank me for bracketing their names; but I am forced to confess that the arguments used by the one to prove the endless absurdities into which we fall when we try to comprehend the Nature of God, are exactly the same arguments that are used by the other to prove that God, as believed in by the orthodox, cannot exist. I quote, however, exclusively from the Dean, because it is at once novel and agreeable to find oneself sheltered by Mother Church at the exact moment when one is questioning her very foundations; and also because the Dean's name carries with it so orthodox an odor,

that his authority will tell where the same words from any of those who are outside the pale of orthodoxy would be regarded with suspicion. Nevertheless, I wish to state plainly that a more "atheistical" book than these Bampton Lectures—at least in the earlier part of it—I have never read; and had its title-page borne the name of any well-known Free-Thinker, it would have been received in the religious world with a storm of indignation.

The first definition laid down by the orthodox as a characteristic of God is that he is an Infinite Being. "There is but one living and true God . . . of *Infinite power*, etc." (Articles of the Church of England, on Religion, 1.) It has been said that *Infinite* only means *Indefinite*, but I must protest against this weakening of a well-defined theological term. The term *Infinite* has always been understood to mean far more than *indefinite*; it means literally boundless: the infinite has no limitations, no possible restrictions, no "circumference". People who do not think about the meaning of the words they use speak very freely and familiarly of the "infinitude" of God, as though the term implied no inconsistency. Deny that God is infinite and you are at once called an atheist, but press your opponent into a definition of the term, and you will generally find that he does not know what he is talking about. Dean Mansel points out, with his accurate habit of mind, all that this attribute of God implies, and it would be well if those who "believe in an infinite God" would try to realise what they express. Half the battle of Free Thought will be won, when people attach a definite meaning to the terms they use. The *Infinite*

has no bounds; then the finite cannot exist. Why? Because in the very act of acknowledging any existence beside the Infinite One, you limit the Infinite. By saying, "This is not God," you at once make him finite, because you set a bound to his nature; you distinguish between him and something else, and by the very act you limit him; that which is not he is as a rock which checks the waves of the ocean; in that spot a limit is found, and in finding a limit the Infinite is destroyed. The orthodox may retort, "this is only a matter of terms"; but it is well to force them into realising the dogmas which they thrust on our acceptance under such awful penalties for rejection. I know what "an infinite God" implies, and, as apart from the universe, I feel compelled to deny the possibility of his existence; surely it is fair that the orthodox should also know what the words they use mean on this head, and give up the term if they cling to a "personal" God, distinct from "creation". Further—and here I quote Dean Mansel verbally—"the 'Infinite' must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of all actual, but of all possible modes of being . . . If any possible mode can be denied of it . . . it is capable of becoming more than it now is, and such a capability is a limitation." [The hiatus refers to the "absolute" being of God, which it is better to consider separately.] "An unrealised possibility is necessarily (a relation and) a limit." Thus is orthodoxy crushed by the powerful logic of its own champion. God is infinite; then, in that case, everything that exists is God; all phenomena are modes of the Divine Being; there is literally nothing which is not God. Will the orthodox accept this

position? It lands them it is true, in the most extreme Pantheism, but what of that? They believe in an "infinite God," and they are therefore necessarily Pantheists. If they object to this, they must give up the idea that their God is infinite at all; there is no half-way position open to them; he is infinite or finite which?

Again, God is "before all things"; he is the only Absolute Being, dependent on nothing outside himself; all that is *not* God is relative; that is to say, that God exists alone and is not necessarily related to anything else.

But what does this "Absolute" imply? A simple impossibility of creation, just as does the Infinite; for creation implies that the relative is brought into existence, and thus the Absolute is destroyed. "Here again," says our Dean, "the Pantheistic hypothesis seems forced upon us. We can think of creation only as a change in the condition of that which already exists, and thus the creature is conceivable only as a phenomenal mode of the being of the Creator." Thus once more looms up the dreaded spectre of Pantheism, the "dreary desolation of a Pantheistic wilderness"; and who is the Moses who has led us into this desert? It is a leader of orthodoxy, a dignitary of the Church; it is Dean Mansel who stretches out his hand to the Universe and says: "This is thy God, O Israel."

The two highest attributes of God land us, then, in the most thorough Pantheism: further, before remarking on the other divine attributes, I would challenge the reader to pause and try to realise this infinite and absolute being. "That a man can be conscious of

the infinite is, then, a supposition which, in the very terms in which it is expressed, annihilates itself . . . The infinite, if it is to be conceived at all, must be conceived as potentially everything and actually nothing; for if there is anything in general which it cannot become, it is thereby limited; and if there is anything in particular which it actually is, it is thereby excluded from being any other thing. But again, it must also be conceived as actually everything and potentially nothing; for an unrealised potentiality is likewise a limitation. If the infinite can be " (in the future) "that which it is not" (in the present) "it is by that very possibility marked out as incomplete and capable of a higher perfection. If it is actually everything, it possesses no characteristic feature by which it can be distinguished from anything else and discerned as an object of consciousness". I think, then, that we must be content, on the showing of Dr. Mansel, to allow that God is, in his own nature—from this point of view—quite beyond the grasp of our faculties; *as regards us he does not exist*, since he is indistinguishable and undiscernable. Well might the Church exclaim: "Save me from my friends!" when a Dean acknowledges that her God is a self-contradictory phantom; oddly enough, however the Church likes it, and accepts this fatal championship.

To some extent Spinoza's Pantheism—except to the highly intellectual, to whom its keen logic and grasp of pure Ideas must remain a delight—may strike the average reader with a sense of chill, and the average devotee with horror and anguish. How differently his work was estimated by thinkers of different schools

may be judged by the term applied to him by Novalis, "a God-intoxicated man," and that bestowed on him by Hume, who called him "a famous Atheist," and characterised his doctrine as a "hideous hypothesis". His fundamental teaching, like the Hindū, established that "Brahman is all"—he did not, of course, use the word "Brahman" but "God". He used the words "God" and "Nature" as synonyms, and regarded God as infinite Substance, the Real; the finite, the limited, the "things," were unreal. The Infinite had two attributes, infinite Intelligence, infinite Extension; the finite are only modes of these, limited, less than the whole; limitation, negation, something wanting, is the character of particular things; they have no real existence. Spinoza's view is essentially a mathematical view, and his doctrines are thus presented by him; one recalls the before-mentioned demand of Pythagoras as a condition necessary for a student, "Mathematics". Mathematics is pure reasoning and admits of no confusion of thought. Spinoza writes:

I did not propose to myself any novel or strange aim, but simply to demonstrate by certain and indubitable reason those things which agree best with practice. And in order that I might enquire into the matters of this science with the same freedom of mind with which we are wont to treat lines and surfaces in mathematics, I determined not to laugh or to weep over the actions of men, but simply to understand them; and to contemplate their affections and passions such as love, hate, anger, envy, or arrogance, pity, and all other disturbances of soul not as vices

of human nature, but as properties pertaining to it in the same way as heat, cold, storm, thunder pertain to the nature of the atmosphere. For these, though troublesome, are yet necessary and have certain causes through which we may come to understand them, and thus by contemplating them in their truth, gain for our minds as much joy as by the knowledge of things that are pleasing to the senses.

We should accustom ourselves to look at happenings as viewed from the centre, from the whole, not from the part affected by any of these, and thus reach the "intellectual love of God". "Acquaint yourself with God," he says to the troubled, "and be at peace."

While this is possible to the gigantic and crystal-clear intelligence of Spinoza, and to his detachment from the senses and the concrete emotions, it is "cold comfort" to the "man in the street". Dean Mansel, despite his keen intelligence, and by no means a "man in the street," felt that the reasoning carried him into the "dreary desolation of a Pantheistic wilderness". The devotee, accustomed to worship his God in the form of a man, or of a vaguely conceived idea of a Perfect Being, naturally feels that his heaven is emptied, and his earth is left desolate.

But Hindū Pantheism gives us a world, a universe, thrilling with Life, pulsing with Love, filled with joyous Lives in every part, a world of exquisite beauty, crowded with lovelinesses heaped one above another, so that every taste has its pleasure of savor, every eye its shapes and a color which enchant it, every ear its sounds of

melody which charm it, every nose its fragrances that are delicious to it. Each of these graded existences from the pebble to the highest Deva¹ sees below him lower creatures he can help and elevate, above him splendid Beings whom he can admire and appeal to for aid, and beyond the yet Mightier Ones before whom he can bow in reverence and in adoration. The most ignorant peasant can find a Deva he can worship, whom he can love, to whom he can pray.

The highest Philosopher, the most passionate and aspiring Devotee, may accept the suggestion:

Let us know Him, the Supreme Ishvara of all Ishvaras, the supreme Deva of all Devas, the Lord of all Lords, the Ishvara of the Ishvaras of worlds.²

There is no limit to anyone's climbing up the long ladder of lives save the limit of his own weakness. The Supreme Ishvara is the Saguna Brahman, who, as just said, is "the embodied Self" of the Nirguna. The One Life, as "the Supreme Ishvara" pours out His streams into all Ishvaras; from these Jivātmās are formed, as we have seen, and the Life is one throughout all.

Is this hard to understand when modern Astronomy tells us of similar gradations of worlds, in which the Jivātmās can unfold? Is it not ever a new delight to have everywhere friends and helpers, and to pass on

¹ A Deva is a "Shining One" an Angel; the word "Ishvara" is applied to the Lord of a universe, or a system. The "Supreme-Ishvara" is the Saguna Brahman.

² *Vāyu Samhitā*, I, iv, 122.

their help to those less evolved than ourselves, but sharers in the same Life? The ever-present Brahman touches us in every embodiment, sends through us His Wisdom, works through us by His Strength, permeates us through His Beauty. None in whom He lives—and He lives in everyone and everything—can really be our enemy, for He is part of ourselves, putting on the mask of enmity that He may bring us some greater good. Cast away *Māyā*, the delusion of separateness, and see everywhere Brahman. He smiles at you from the eyes of your friend, plays with you in your child, comforts you in your sorrow, rejoices with you in your joy, upholds you in your weakness; beneath you are the Everlasting Arms; around you the Eternal Energy; above you the Bliss of Realisation, when you can truly say: “I am He.” “Where then is grief,” rings out the triumphant cry; “Where then is grief, where delusion, for him who hath seen the Oneness?”

Can this be called cold, or repellent, or formal? Does it leave us “without God,” when we meet Him everywhere? Let me put it in the simpler form in which it may be summarised from the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, in the luminous interpretation given in the seventh and eighth, and the twelfth to the fifteenth *Adhyāyas*. *Shrī Krishna* speaks as the Supreme *Īshvara*, the “forth-streaming life,” illustrated in the eleventh *Adhyāya*, that bewildered *Arjuna*.

Earth, water, fire, air and ether, the five “elements” of our material universe, with the *Antahkarana*—the internal organ of embodied consciousness, *Manas*, *Buddhi* and *Ahamkāra*, that is, mind, reason and

egoity or I-ness—are His inferior Nature. Students of Mme. Blavatsky may remember that she accurately places all our sevenfold universe with its Ishvara, on the lowest kosmic plane, or level, of embodied consciousness. His other Nature, the Higher, is the Life-Element, by which the universe is upheld. He is the source of the forthgoing of the universe, and also the place of its dissolution. The knowledge of the elements (science) is the knowledge of His inferior Nature. The knowledge of the Shining Ones, the Devas—Angels and Archangels—is the knowledge of His Life-giving Nature (reached in exoteric religions). The knowledge of His essential Nature, that of Brahman, is the knowledge of the SELF. The worlds, beginning with the world of Brahmā, the fivefold universes, stream forth and are dissolved in endless succession. The place from which they stream forth, to which they return, and in which they dissolve is the lower Unmanifested. Higher than that is another Unmanifested, the Eternal, the Supreme Ishvara, the Saguna Brahman. All the world is pervaded by His unmanifested aspect, in which all beings are rooted. For they enter His Life Element at the end of a World-Age, and at the beginning of a World-Age He again emanates them: this is His Action. The embodiment of His Life-Element in Nature, which is His own, as Purushottama, the Supreme Purusha, including the embodiment of a fragment of Himself, mamāmsha, as Jivātmās in all beings, is His Sacrifice. The Christian religion has this idea and speaks of the sacrificial Lamb, “slain from the foundation of the world”. Every true sacrifice by us is the free offering of the SELF in us for

the helping of others. "The foolish disregard Me when clad in human semblance, ignorant of My Supreme Nature the Great Lord of beings."

As all grades of beings are the forth-pouring of this Divine Life, so all, evolving during a World Period, have their appropriate happiness between their mortal lives, longer in proportion to their intellectual and emotional development. We learn, still from the great Teacher, who, as He said elsewhere, gave the *Bhagavad-Gītā* in "a high state of Yoga," that each goes to his own place. "They who worship the Shining Ones go to the Shining Ones; to the ancestors go the ancestor-worshippers; to the Bhūtas (Elementals, Nature Spirits) go those who sacrifice to Bhūtas, and My Worshippers come unto Me." All worship the One, even those who worship Devas irregularly, for their faith cometh from Him, though distorted by ignorance. Men full of worldly desires go to other Shining Ones, and whatever the aspect of the object of worship, unswerving faith comes from the Lord of all, and the worshippers gain their desires, and each in the "spacious heaven-world" finds his desired objects; having exhausted the fruit of their good deeds they return to this mortal world. "Following the virtues enjoined by the three (Vedas), desiring desires, they obtain the transitory." Limited is the happiness obtained by those of small intelligence, but still they have their heaven.

Such is Hindū Pantheism as Philosophy and Religion, meeting, as said before, every human need.

To the Darshanas, "Views" of the Veda, the Six Systems of Hindū Philosophy, I can only allude, for

lack of time, and that for this reason: that Hinduism places no fetters on the intellect; man may think as long as he can. There is no penalty on thought; there is no blasphemy in investigation. There is nothing too sacred to be challenged. "Brahman is fearless"; you are Brahman; how then should you fear?

The Advaita Vedānta is peculiarly interesting for Indians, for it is the intellectual link between Hinduism and Islām, through the great doctors of Islām's most brilliant age of learning. If you refer to their philosophical conceptions of the Nature of God, you will find them practically identical with those of the Advaita Vedānta. The other link is that of Yoga, of Mysticism, of Sūfism, for all Mystics have the same experience, when they reach SELF-Realisation. To that I shall come in a few moments. But, as already seen, even these highest manifestations of human Intellect cannot comprehend the Supreme. In fact, the Lord Buddha said the last word of logic in the famous passage in the Udāna Mārga, the Chinese version of the Pāli *Dhammapada*.

Bhixus, the uncreated, the invisible, the unmade, the elementary, the unproduced, exist, (as well as) the created, the visible, the made, the conceivable, the compound, the produced; and there is an uninterrupted connection between the two.

Bhixus, if the uncreated, the invisible, the unmade, the elementary, the unproduced was nonentity, I could not say that the result of their connection from cause to effect with the created, the visible, the made, the compound, the conceivable was final emancipation.

Bhixus, it is because of the real existence of the uncreated, the invisible, the elementary, the unproduced, that I say that the result of their connection from cause to effect with the created, the visible, the made, the compound, the conceivable, is final emancipation.

The impermanency of the created, the visible, the made, the produced, the compound, the great torment of subjection to old age, death, and ignorance, what proceeds from the cause of eating; (all this) is destroyed, and there is found no delight in it; this is the essential creature of final emancipation. Then there will be no doubts and scruples; all sources of suffering will be stopped, and one will have the happiness of the peace of the *samskāra*.¹

An interesting suggestion may here be made as to the relation of the three stages of Moksha and the three branches of the Vedānta—the Advaita, the Vishishtādvaita, and the Dvaita; the “without Duality,” the “without Duality with a difference,” and the “Duality”. It will be remembered that Shri Krishna spoke of the difficulty which confronted those who sought to worship the Unmanifested, “for the path of the Unmanifested is hard for the embodied to tread”;² this evidently refers to Brahman, who as the Supreme Ishvara, is spoken of as “another Unmanifested,” the Daivī Prakriti, the Supreme Ishvara,

¹ *Udanavārga*. Being the northern version of *Dhammapada*. Translation by W. Woodville Rockhill. See under “Nirvāna,” 21-24, Ed. 1883, pp. 120-123.

² *Bhagavad-Gītā*, xii, 3-5.

who on entering name and form became Jivātmās of every grade, including the Īshvaras who are the Life-and-Form, who is the centre of every System, "Nārāyana in the Sun". Here we recognise that Hidden God, the triple-aspected Lord of every system, the Brahmā, Vishnu, Shiva of the Hindū religion. The devotee who seeks Moksha may worship one of These, and according to the object of his worship will be Him with whom he becomes united in the sevenfold universe; the Moksha in Brahmā is Nirvāna, the Ātmic world; in the Anupādaka, is that of the Monad, the union with Vishnu; in the Parā or Ādi-Nirvāna, is the union with Shiva. The Buddhist has the three corresponding "bodies," the Nirmānakāya, the Sambhogakāya, the Dharmakāya. The Liberated SELF who takes the Nirmānakāya remains in touch with this world as a reservoir of blessing, pouring down streams of help; this is the natural Moksha of the Dvaita; of the work of the other two Great Ones I know nothing, but the taking of the Dharmakāya is popularly said to cut off the Wearer from this world.

It is worth noting in passing that the Monism of Haeckel and the Sāmkhya are closely allied in their view of "origins," and a parallel study of the two would be interesting and instructive. There is a curious reflection in modern chemistry of the result of Sāmkhyān "propinquity" of the Purusha to Prakriti. The presence of a substance, called a catalyst, while remaining itself entirely unaffected—so far as the chemist can perceive—sets up activity in another substance and causes a chemical combination otherwise difficult to produce. Thus, a piece of platinum, in

propinquity to $\text{SO}_2 + \text{O}$ causes them to combine into SO_3 . The platinum is apparently unaffected, and can perform the same service over and over again. This is a fact in Nature, while the Sāmkhya is the teaching of a Sage. All the activities of Prakriti, Nature, are due to the presence of Purusha, who is Himself unaffected.

The two "eternal ways" of the world, the Forth-going and the Return, the two great stages of the journey of the Pilgrim Soul, are both marked during their long course by Action, but on the Path of Pravritti, the Action is done for the gaining of its results, "the fruit of Action," and on the Path of Return, Action is done for the sake of Sacrifice, in union with the great Sacrifice. Most of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* is a Scripture of Yoga by Action, of right and wrong Action, Action which is duty and therefore ought to be done, and Action which is prompted by desire and which binds to the wheel of births and deaths. All Action binds, whether good or evil, since it brings the appropriate results; but the Action which is Sacrifice detaches itself from the apparent doer, who has no interest in its result. Wisdom also breaks the bonds of Action, for the wise man knows that there is only one Actor, and he realises: "I do not anything."

The *Bhagavad-Gītā* is so well known on this theme, that it is not necessary to multiply shlokas from it. The Hindū Ideal comes out plainly: The body lives by taking and assimilating what is taken; the life unfolds by giving. The thoughtful while still treading the path of Forth-going, will seek to find happiness in the things that last rather than in those which perish

in the using. He will cultivate his emotions and his mind, rather than seek transient pleasure in food, or clothing, or physical delights; he knows that these fade with age, and cannot be carried to the other side of death. But the high emotions, the right thoughts, follow him to the subtler worlds, and are the material for a long and happy life beyond the river of death. Besides, these increase, rather than diminish, as he shares them, and in the sharing he finds happiness. The time comes when this subtle pleasure predominates over the pleasure of gaining, and Action which is Sacrifice becomes in itself attractive. Then he begins to turn his face homewards, and deliberately determines to quicken his steps.

Each of the two Paths has a triple division within itself, and men, first unconsciously, and then consciously, seek that way of the three which attracts by its affinity to the temperament. The man in whom mind predominates seeks for knowledge; the man in whom the emotions predominate seeks objects who command his admiration, his love, and finds a keen pleasure in unselfish loving, in devotion to one he feels to be greater than himself; the man who seeks expression in activity, who desires to work, to serve, actively to oppose the wrong and to struggle for the right, finds his delight in action. As they turn homewards, the first passes into the Jñāna Mārga, the Path of Knowledge; the second into the Bhakti Mārga, the Path of Devotion; the third into the Karma Mārga, the Path of Action.

When first the desire arises for the quickening of evolution, the aspirant naturally turns to Yoga, and

seeks to learn the special methods which will aid him in the search for his goal.

Let us consider what Yoga means, not the mere word, but its significance. The Jivātmā has lived in the stone, showing the attribute of Sat. He becomes too strong as Ichchhā presses against its rigid encasement in the stone; he desires to feel, and he passes into the plant. Again, his limits are too rigid, for Chit seeks a suitable medium, and he changes to the animal and thence to man. In man, the accumulated forces of the expanding Jivātmā, who has, we have seen, the "nature of Brahman," press him on in evolution, and a time comes when the slowly evolving human bodies are too small for him.

As man, he moves slowly onwards, and—compressing long ages into a few sentences—he is in the Kshipta stage, "Butterfly-mind," flitting from flower to flower of Life, tasting every pleasure, attracted by every joy, constant to naught. "He is not fit for Yoga," says Patanjali. He grows into Youth, he is in the Mūḍha stage, bewildered by surging emotions; again the sentence is passed: "He is not fit for Yoga." He becomes mature, he passes into the Vikshipta stage, is mastered by a thought which possesses him, drives him, dominates him; he has a fixed idea; if true, he becomes a saint, a hero, a martyr; if false, he wins a huge success in life, or, may be, becomes a madman. "He is approaching Yoga," says Patanjali. He possesses the idea, he is not possessed by it; he has reached the Ekāgratā stage, one-pointedness; "He is fit for Yoga," decides Patanjali. What method of Yoga shall he follow? That has practically been decided

by his temperament; he continues what he has followed for so long. "In this world there is a twofold path," says Shri Krishna, "that of Yoga by Knowledge, of the Sāmkhyas; and that of Yoga by Action, of the Yogīs." But both join at last.

I said that I would mention in speaking of Yoga, a method of awakening vibrations in the Buddhic sheath, the Ānandamayakosha. This belongs to the devotee, who having developed an intense love for the Object of his heart, and having purified his love from all selfish desires, being wrapt in intense contemplation of his Lord, causes strong and rapid vibration in the most subtle ether of the astral world, in the Manomayakosha. The world of the emotions and world of union are linked together, and the vibrations of the lower arouse sympathetic vibrations in the higher. The devotee, not yet able to initiate these in the higher, can obtain an answering vibration from the sheath he cannot yet reach directly, and there comes to him that peculiar thrill of joy, peaceful, serene, intense, from the higher world, the prophecy of the bliss which in the future shall be his.

His definite training of the mind and the emotions leads to his becoming self-controlled; he masters his emotions, he masters his mind, he is in the Shraddhā stage, he can practise Yoga. In the third stage he practises Viveka, the discrimination between the Real and the unreal, and comes to the decision to seek only the Real. In the fourth, he learns Vairāgya, dispassion, indifference to the unreal, and a determined search for the Real. In the fifth, he practises Shatsampatti, the six endowments, or qualities. These

are: Shama, control of the mind; Dama, control of action; Uparati, Tolerance; Titikshā, Endurance; Shraddhā confidence in the SELF, the Jivātmā; Mūmukshā desire for Liberation. These were the qualifications laid down by Shri Shamkarāchārya for the study of the Advaita Vedānta, and had these been carefully observed there would be fewer of the deluded men whom Shri Krishna termed hypocrites.

The control of the mind is the difficulty on which so many fail. Of old, Arjuna made the despairing complaint, that the mind was impetuous, strong, difficult to bend, hard to curb as the wind. Answers Shri Krishna: "Without doubt, O mighty-armed, the mind is hard to curb and restless; but it may be curbed by constant practice (abhyāsa) and by dispassion." Let me warn you not to seek dispassion by the killing out of love. That is the way to darkness. It must be born of the overwhelming attraction of the SELF, by raising love for all to the level of the love felt for the most beloved individual, not by chilling it down. Dispassion is indifference to matter; Love is life calling to Life.

Patanjali defines Yoga as "the inhibition of the vrittis," the "being," the modes of the mind, the way in which the mind exists. Literally, remember that "mind," as used in Yoga, means Antahkarana, the "internal organ," and is said to be fourfold: Manas, Buddhi, Ahamkāra and Chitta; this is the part of consciousness called Cognition, and does not include Desire nor Activity; Chitta, however, is not a fourth division but the summation of the three into a single word, a unity. I have elsewhere suggested that if

Manas be taken as one side of a triangle, Buddhi as a second side, and Ahamkāra as the third, then Chitta is the triangle as a whole.

By Yoga alone can the changes be brought about, by which SELF-Realisation can be achieved; then it is that at length

Bliss, first manifested as Desire is changed into Will.

Wisdom, first manifested as Thought is changed into Pure Reason.

Activity, first manifested as Work is changed into Sacrifice.

While this is being accomplished, the Yogī has become practically acquainted with the three stages of ordinary consciousness: Jāgrat, the waking state in which human beings normally live while awake; Svapna, the "dream" consciousness, the consciousness working in the astral world; Sushupti, the consciousness in the Mānasic world, the world from which it can make no impression on the physical brain. The brief *Māndūkyopanishat* is devoted to the subject, and gives the four "states of consciousness". Here the Jāgrat consciousness is called Vaishvānara, and is described as that in which knowledge consists of external objects. The Svapna is called Taijasa, the radiant, "whose seat is in dream"—because man leaves the physical body in sleep—"whose knowledge is the internal objects".

When the sleeper desires no desires, sees no dream, this is sound sleep. His third condition is Prājñā (who completely knows), who has become one, whose knowledge is single, whose nature is like bliss, who enjoys bliss, whose mouth (nature) is knowledge.

The fourth state is called Turiya; that is a state beyond the limitations of the fivefold world. Reaching that the Yogī is said to be, as to his consciousness, in a state in which he is

invisible, imperceptible, unseizable, incapable of proof, beyond thought, not to be defined, whose only proof is the conviction in the SELF, in whom all the spheres have ceased, who is tranquil, blissful and without (consciousness of) duality.

This, says the Upanishat, is the OM, and the conditions of consciousness are the A, the U, and the M. Vaishvānara is the A. Taijasa the U. Prājñā is the M. Again here, we have this symbolic use of the sounds of the letters.

It will be seen why Shri Shamkarāchārya, who intended his Vedānta to be the road for the Jñāni to follow, insisted on Viveka, Vairāgya, and Shatsampatti as the conditions of its study. It was not meant to be a mere intellectual delight, but that training, that discipline, that achievement, which would lead to Union with the SELF, when it was crowned with Devotion. Such a training would destroy all carelessness, all heedlessness, would leave the intellect purified, its true nature unclouded, and make it capable of union with Buddhi, forming the Spiritual Ego, fit to be united with Ātmā, the triple-aspected SELF, once more One, the Pilgrim Soul, his pilgrimage finished, the Son, bringing his sheaves of experiences with him, returning at length to the Father's house to become one with his Father as before he went forth, but with

the liberty of the universe he has conquered, able to work, undeluded, on every plane of being. Then he has achieved the superhuman life, that life of service which is freedom, which is joy. He descended into Matter, that he might conquer Matter; he has been crucified in it, that he might spiritualise it as his servant for the redemption of new worlds. Once blinded by Matter, he has now become omniscient. Once bound in Matter, he has broken its bonds and is free. Darkness has been changed to Light. The tumult of the earth has died away and Stillness, Silence, surround him. Into the Stillness there steals a movement, which rises into music, the song of the morning stars rejoicing as a new star shines out in his place. Into the Silence is breathed a note melodious as the chiming of silver bells, welcoming the Child of Man who knows himself as God. He is clothed in the robe of eternal Life. He shines with the radiance of a deathless Bliss. He is the Inner Ruler, who has put an end to pain, and he enters into the Peace of the ETERNAL.

III. ART

IN dealing with this very complicated subject, you will pardon me if I keep within my own limitations, and speak not as an Artist but as a student, and a student of what may be called the Philosophy of Beauty, its nature, its derivation from the Supreme Self, its expression in beautiful things, its relation to humanity in its evolution, its influence on national and individual evolution, the ideal of all Art, not only of its partial realisation in the Fine Arts. You will remember how the Shilpa were taught in the great Universities of India, and how the sons of monarchs and of nobles did not confine themselves to the study of those belonging specially to their own walk in life, but also paid attention to those which concerned the crafts of the working craftsman, as well as to those which dealt with the major Arts, Music, Architecture, Painting, Sculpture, wherein great achievements meant exceptional genius in the Artist, the Priest of the Beautiful.

Many are the disputes as to what constitutes Beauty, from which emerge two fundamentally opposed views, one ancient and one comparatively modern, each embodying the method of the Age to which it belongs: the Ancient Way of Knowing, the Knowledge of THAT by whom all things are known, the descending from the universal to the particulars, from the Idea to the forms; the Modern Way of Knowing, the study of

the particulars by the process of observation, classification, induction, hypothesis, verification by experiment, and finally the assertion of a law.

Is there anything congruous with this method in the conception of the Beautiful, and is it a creation of the human mind gained by an analysis of beautiful things, things accepted as beautiful by thoughtful and cultured people; and then, by seeking something which all have in common, by virtue of which they are thus accepted, can we rise by a synthesis, so reaching some natural law of Beauty, which does not depend upon anything peculiar to the individual, the peculiarities which cause some savages to regard as beautiful distortions of the human form which, to the more evolved of the race, appear both grotesque and repellent? Does Beauty, as is contended by some, lie in the mind of the observer, not in the form or features of the admired observed? If so, this would explain why what is hideous to one appears as beautiful to another. Is Beauty a mere matter of convention, whether civilised or savage? Tolstoy—to whom we shall need to return again later on—asserts:

There are only two definitions of Beauty; the one objective, mystical, merging this conception into the highest perfection, God, . . . the other . . . which considers Beauty to be simply that which pleases . . . There are only two fundamental conceptions . . . the first is that Beauty is something having an independent existence (existing in itself), that it is one of the manifestations of the absolutely perfect, of the Idea, of the Spirit, of Will, of God; the other that.

Beauty is a kind of pleasure received by us, not having personal advantage for its object . . . There is no objective definition of Beauty. The existing definitions—both the metaphysical and the experimental—amount only to one and the same: objective definition, which is (strange as it may seem to say so) that Art is that which makes Beauty manifest, and Beauty is that which pleases.¹

Bhagavan Das' own view—and it is that of a deep thinker and fine scholar—I shall state in referring to Rasa.

In seeking the Ideals of India, most ancient of Nations, we naturally turn to the Ancient Way of Knowing, and seek in the Universal the Ideal of Beauty, the origin of all beautiful things. In the Supreme Self we find the triple aspect Sat, Chit, Ānanda: Being, Cognition, Will. To which of these should we relate Beauty? I submit that it is a composite of the three: of Being as Becoming, of Cognition as the awareness, the recognition, of things considered by the observer as beautiful, of Will which, as desire, seeks to appropriate these as happiness-giving.

Beauty is usually regarded as a "complex emotion," and an emotion is a desire, refined and permeated by the mind. Thus sexual craving, mere lust, a physical desire, becomes refined and transmuted into love, an emotion, capable of stimulating the lover into the noblest heroism and sacrifice, whether the love be directed to a human being, a Divinity, or an Ideal.

¹ Quoted in *The Science of the Emotions*, by Bhagavan Das, Third Edition, revised and enlarged, 1924, pp. 414, 415.

The third aspect, in the Supreme Ishvara, as in all Ishvaras, in Becoming, is a manifestation of Beauty in all His works—His *Activity* is Beauty. The Ancient Wisdom declares this omnipresent fact, whether it comes down from old Egypt in the symbolical form of Freemasonry, or revels in natural beauty, due to the embodiment of Devas, in the Vaidic hymns; and this is equally though less poetically asserted by modern Science in its microscopical researches, when it finds that, let its vision be extended to embrace the minutest forms yet reached, they are ever beautiful, and exquisitely finished by the Divine Artificer of our world.

It is in the Philosophy of Hindū India that her Ideals of Beauty are firmly rooted, and in Art, as in all manifestations of the Divine Life, it is Cosmic Ideation, the Creative Activity of the Divine Thought, which—bodying itself forth in subtlest matter in which Sattva, Harmony, predominates over Tamas and Rajas—imposes Beauty: the inter-harmonious relation between all parts of every form, that is the essential characteristic of every Type-Idea, or Arche-type, whence all special forms belonging to that Archetype are generated. The so-called Arūpa, formless, world is so called because its “forms” are Archetypes. Substantial Ideas, within which lie hid the possibilities of all particulars which fulfil the necessary conditions of that Archetype. Take the Triangle: what is it? three right lines so inclined to each other as to enclose two right angles. Myriads of particular triangles fulfil that definition, and it is possible, after much practice and at a considerable strain on the brain, to visualise that “formless” Triangle, which includes the possibilities of all triangles.

To clairvoyant vision, exercised on the Arūpa level, such a "formless" Triangle can be seen projected into denser concrete thought-matter, and there exploding in all directions into an uncountable number of triangles of all shapes and sizes, but all fulfilling the definition of a triangle. The Higher Mind of man, the Intellect, or Pure Reason, the Ego, the I-ness of man, Ahamkāra, is part of the Chitta, or consciousness, spoken of yesterday, and musing over this, devotees may gain some glimpse of the possibilities of a single Deva being seen simultaneously in places far apart from each other, in answer to invocations from his devotees.

This conception is found in all the ancient faiths, and Hebrew writers, commenting on their esoteric Sacred Books, have dwelt on this fact that all exists as Idea before there is manifestation in the world of Forms.

Take with this the Greek idea of the Supreme Divinity, as the Good, the Beautiful, and the True, and you have in "the Beautiful" the abstract Idea, of which the essence, the Real, the Eternal, is Beauty, whence all beautiful particulars, concrete things, emanate, come forth, as though it were an aroma, which gives its fragrance to many objects, making each sweet with its touch.

If the view of Plato and the Indian view are put side by side, they will be found to be practically identical, and this is natural, since Plato was initiated into the Egyptian Mysteries, which taught Realities, as they existed in the higher worlds, and passing into the world of grosser matter became cloaked in unrealities. To Plato, Universals were Real, were true Being; particulars share, as it were, are derived from, the Realities.

The Idea is that which the Middle Age schoolmen of Europe called the "substance"; the materials they called the "accidents," which formed the concrete object, that which it was in the physical world. Beauty has Real Being, and all beautiful things have this quality, which makes them Beautiful; they do not exist as Beautiful by human thought, but by Divine Ideation. The universe lives and moves "according to God," as Plato taught, and all beautiful things are as veils through which eternal Beauty shines.

Mr. C. Jinarājadāsa, in his booklet on *Art and the Emotions*, says of these Archetypes, that they "are the creations of God, the ways in which He thinks and feels. God, in the high world of His Mind, on His Cosmic mental plane, creates the Archetypes, which Plato was first among (western, A.B.) philosophers to reveal to us, and we approach near these Archetypes through the understanding we have of Art" (*Loc. cit.*, p. 42).

Bhagavan Das puts the same view in Indian language: "That which pleases is Beauty to us; that which pleases us most, that which pleases all and every one most, is the Self. The Self is absolutely Beautiful, without any flaw, for it pleases *everyone*. The Self is Absolute Beauty. The final and only definition of Absolute Beauty is that it is the Self. It has to be found within; and then it is found without, everywhere, all around." ¹

Then he summarises from the Upanishats:

"The Self is the most Beautiful, the best Beloved. It is Bliss itself, Ānandamaya; all else that pleases

¹ *Science of the Emotions*, p. 417.

and is loved, is loved for the sake of It. It is the most 'tasteful,' the sweetest to taste: It is Rasa; it is taste itself" . . . What wonder then (he continues) that the definitions of Beauty should range from experimental to metaphysical, from empirical to transcendental; should include "the pleasure from food, drink, etc.," and also mystical Perfection, Absolute God; should embrace "philosophy, religion and life itself". (*Ibid.*, pp. 417, 418.)

We might then say that, as the Life of Ishvara is immanent in everything in His universe, so the aspect of His Life which is Beauty is immanent in all beautiful things.

Rasa is a word which in its many-aspected meaning is, I think, peculiar to Samskrit Literature, in Poetry, in Literature, in Art. Bhagavan Das quotes the *Sāhitya Darpana*, that "the *body* of a Poem consists of the words and the ideas or images conveyed by them; its *soul* is the *rasa*, the emotion-motive, the feeling interest". "The characteristic of Poetry is such *rasa*. Its business is to call up an emotion and then hold it in, so that its corresponding feeling of pleasure is 'tasted' at leisure". (*Ibid.*, pp. 335, 336.)

Looking at these ideas, we can make our definition of Art: It is an attempt to bring down within the vision of ordinary mortals some of the Divine Beauty of which the Artist catches glimpses; he strives to translate these into colors, sounds, forms, words, by creating pictures, melodies, sculptures, poems and other literature, reproducing in others through his special art the pleasurable emotion aroused in himself by his

glimpses of supernal Beauty, sensed by the Ego. Take Mozart's description of how he heard some of his great music in a world other than ours; there he realised it in a single impression, as of a wondrous chord, which he had to write down in successive notes when he came again to this lower world. Or Tennyson's description of a state into which he passed, when death became a laughable absurdity, and the state he was in the only true life.

For all true Art, as all true Science, comes from Above, through mortals of our race who have risen above the crowd by memory and imagination—imagination based on memory, not memory of physical happiness, but of the Ego, when in some rapt moment of ecstasy, freed from physical limitations, he touches illuminated reach of wondrous manifestation, lit by the Light which is from Above.

Take Music and Architecture, and you will understand the feeling which made Goethe describe some great religious Cathedral as "frozen music"; listen to some true melody, and let yourself drift away upon its waves, and see an exquisite fairy structure rise before your closed eyes, reproducing the melody which bore you into a subtler world, wherein sounds build forms, and gracious temples rise around you, built by the music which Devas use to erect in lines of light those shining fanes.

Mr. C. Jinarājadāsa, in *Art and the Emotions*, says on this head:

When we come to great architecture, we have the same mystical quality of telling us of what has

well been called the "bass notes of Nature," those fundamental qualities of solid matter as it rises at the bidding of thought into a magnificent Parthenon. We see the quality of true architecture in modern days in such a building as the Tāj Mahāl, at Agra; it is there as if some wonderful thought, which a great artist made in the higher mental world, had come down and materialised itself in marble. And, because it is such a great thought, you can see many, many things in that building; see it at sunrise, and it tells you one message of Beauty; see it in moonlight, and it is all mysterious and different; see it in the evening light, and it is different again. You can go a thousand times and see something new. Why? Because it is a great piece of Art. It is perfect. A great concept is there, as, unfortunately, it exists in its entirety in very few buildings.

In architecture there is rhythm in the light dark spaces, in the size of the doorways, in the length and breadth of the cornices. My friend Claude Bragdon in America, who is himself an architect, has dealt with the relation of music to architecture in his book, *The Beautiful Necessity*, why it is that certain windows are beautiful, certain pillars graceful, and why certain proportions of light and shade give a sense of harmony and rhythm. It is because they are fundamentally expressing the message of music. (*Loc. cit.*, pp. 36-38.)

When we remember that Beauty is clothed in the matter in which Sattva, Harmony, predominates, it

is easy to see why music, the very embodiment of Harmony, is the highest of the arts, and is so much in evidence in religious services. It aids meditation, soothes the restless mind into serenity, and exalts the feeling of Bhakti.

Natarāja dancing, as in the wondrous figure in the heart of the great temple of Chidambaram, shakes from His Damru the sounds which build worlds, for creation is the activity of the High Gods, whose laughter falls in golden rain of benedictions on Their Work, and all the Sons of God surround it, shouting for joy.

But Tolstoy, collecting all kinds of definitions of Art from scientists and others, disagrees with them all, for they are all "inexact". Words mostly are inexact in striving to convey impressions. His own explanation is not particularly illuminating.

Art is not, as the metaphysicians say, the manifestation of some mysterious idea of Beauty or God; it is not, as the aesthetical physiologists say, a game in which man lets off his excess of stored-up energy; it is not the expression of man's emotions by external signs; it is not the production of pleasing objects; and above all, *it is not pleasure*; but *it is a means of union among men*, joining them together in the same feelings, and *indispensable for the life and progress towards well-being of individuals and of humanity.* (*Loc. cit.*, p. 428).

The negations are clear, but the affirmation is even more "inexact" than the definitions he rejects. For there are many means of union among men by joining

them together in the same feelings, say those aroused in a bull-fight or a boxing-match. Yet surely no one would call these Art. But Art is "a means of union among men," and is what he says; but his definition is also incomplete and imperfect.

Rabindranath Tagore in dealing with "What is Art?"—and few have a better right to answer the question—says:

The rhetoricians of old India had no hesitation in saying that enjoyment is the soul of literature—the enjoyment which is disinterested. But the word enjoyment has to be used with caution. When analysed, its spectrum shows an endless series of rays of different colors and intensity throughout its different worlds of stars. The art world contains elements which are distinctly its own and which emit lights that have their own range and property. It is our duty to distinguish them, and arrive at their origin and growth . . . For man as well as for animals, it is necessary to give expression to feelings of pleasure and displeasure, fear, anger, and love. In animals these emotional expressions have gone little beyond their bounds of usefulness. But in man though they still have their roots in their original purposes, they have spread their branches far and high in the infinite sky above their soil. Man has a fund of emotional energy which is not all occupied with his self-preservation. This surplus seeks its outlet in the creation of Art, for man's civilisation is built upon his surplus. (*Loc. cit.*, pp. 420, 421.)

A striking idea, worth thinking over, but to my mind it does not go to the true origin. The view of the Italian, Benedetto Croce, who declares: "Art is *vision* or *intuition*," is true; it is the vision, or the intuition, of the Beauty aspect of the SELF. The Artist sees more, intuits more, than the man of the world. It is this which makes him the Priest of the Beautiful, the mediator between blind men and the Divine aspect which is Beauty, the Revealer of the hidden Beauty, so often hidden by unrealities.

"Carlyle," says Mr. Jinarājadāsa, in the work before quoted, "has described Art with a swifter phrase than anyone else I know; he has said: 'Art is the disimprisoned Soul of Fact.' When a fact is before us, we know it as such by our mind; but that fact has underlying it, within it, more than its mere outer aspect; it has a 'Soul of Fact,' and Art is that disimprisoned Soul of Fact. In other words, it is the function of Art in all its branches to bring us to the essence of things, which essence is eternal and not temporary." (*Loc. cit.*, 18.)

Again, he quotes Carlyle:

Genuine "Art" in all times is a higher synonym for God Almighty's Facts—which come to us direct from heaven, but in so abstruse a condition, and cannot be read at all, till the better intellect interpret them. That is the real function of our Aristos and of his divine gift. (*Ibid.*, p. 74.)

Once more we find ourselves in the region of Archetypes, of the Divine Ideation which is Creative Activity.

Mr. Jinarājādāsa regards music as the greatest of the Arts, and this for several reasons. He notes that other arts are at their best when they shew a musical quality; thus he quotes with approval the statement that in "poetry of the first order every word is raised to a higher power. It continues to be an articulate sound and a logical step in the argument; but it becomes also a musical sound and a centre of emotional force". "Coleridge, (says Carlyle) remarks very pertinently that wherever you find a sentence musically worded, or true rhythm and melody in the words, there is something deep and good in the words too. For body and soul, word and idea, go strangely together here as everywhere. It is only when the heart of him is rapt into the true passion of melody and the very tones of him become musical by the greatness, depth and music of his thoughts, that we can give him the right to rhyme and sing; that we call him a Poet, and listen to him as the Heroic of Speakers whose speech is song." So also he quotes Walter Pater, regarded in the West as one of the greatest writers on art:

All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music.

It is the art of music which most completely realises this artistic ideal, this perfect identification of form and matter. In its ideal consummate moments, the end is not distinct from the means, the form from the matter, the subject from the expression; and to it, therefore, to the condition of its perfect moments, all the arts may be supposed constantly to tend and aspire. Music then, and not poetry, as is so often

supposed, is the true type or measure of consummate art. Therefore, although each has its incommunicable element, its untranslatable order of impressions, its unique mode of reaching "the imaginative reason," yet the arts may be represented as continually struggling after the law or principle of music, to a condition which music alone completely realises. (pp. 78-79.)

The artist is great or small by the greatness or smallness of his Ego, not by the deftness of his hands. No perfection of technique can avail if naught comes through it; it is but as a tinkling cymbal. Plato, with clear vision of the relation between the outer and the inner worlds, said that you could foretell the outbreak of a revolution by the change of the people's taste in music. Art belongs to the life-side of Nature, and hence the type of a Nation's Art is a "key-signature," a "mind-signature," of the Nation's inner life. Frivolous music attracts the "butterfly mind". The fierce "Ca ira" set the French crowd singing it into a wild whirling dance through the streets in the days of the Revolution, and it came back during the days of the Commune. I was at a Socialist fête in Paris some years later, and suddenly the strains rang out, and in a moment the hall was filled with whirling couples in wild gyrations: beside me was an Englishman, and presently I heard him mutter "I can't stand this!" and he turned round suddenly, and seized an elderly fat lady, of all that was most respectable, of the bourgeoisie type, and he whirled her off into the whirlpool of whirling dancers, as mad as the rest of them.

How opposite is the effect of sacred Indian music, how closely is it allied to Nature, and how accurately it sings itself into her moods. The *rāga* of the morning freshness cannot be used in the evening hour, for music is Nature's moods intellectualised and made articulate in the world of Buddhi. It is the vibration mode that here becomes Sound, which is the Creative Power acting on the higher ethers and, travelling through them to our world, sets the denser air into waves; even down here it builds and shatters, it creates and destroys; hence its enormous power over a crowd, where it is in harmony with their dominant emotion, and, raising it to the *n*th power, it tosses them about as it will.

I spoke early in this lecture on Being and Becoming: Ishvara as Being is transcendent, and when He passes into Becoming, when He emanates a universe, as there said, it is His Activity which is everywhere immanent, His Sacrifice that gives a fragment of Himself for its establishment, with the *Jivātmās* who are to be its tenants. They, as *Monads*, as we have seen, abide in the higher world of Being, after sending out a ray to annex the atom in the highest section of the fivefold universe of Becoming. That Ray is the connecting link with Being throughout the Pilgrimage of mortal life, and it recognises Beauty as the manifestation of Being in all creative work of Ishvara during the period of His Activity, and hence the infinite number of beautiful things which bear Beauty as His hall-mark, the signature of the Divine Artist. The Being is Beauty; the beautiful particulars are in a continual flux of Becoming, on the wheel of births and deaths. Art is

the creative activity of Man, his heritage from his "Father-in-Heaven," and his duty, as animated by the One Life, is to make himself, in all his creative activities, a co-worker with the Supreme Artist, a centre of Beauty, and a creator of beautiful thoughts, beautiful words and beautiful actions. Ugliness, dirt, unseemly behavior, coarse words, rough speech, clumsy actions, are all offences against the law of Nature, which is, as Goethe said, the Garment by which we See God. Nature's ceaseless efforts to eradicate the ugly and to restore Beauty: her spreading of bushes and flowers over a huge pile of debris, caused by the neighborhood of a mine, are interesting to note as years pass by. The hideous pile becomes a grass-covered hillock, and trees begin to grow upon it, and birds nest in them, and drop seeds of future beauties, until all signs of man's ravages have been covered over by her flower-filled hands, and her numberless agents, birds and squirrels, and bees, and all wild things, help to restore Beauty to the desolate area, and make the desert blossom as the rose. Man can be Nature's best co-worker and he will, for he can work for a foreseen purpose, and steadily co-operate with her and quicken the working of her laws; for all Nature cries out to man to use his intelligence in her service, and welcomes his every understanding effort to carry out her slowly working purposes for the benefit of all who live. He can quicken the Becoming, and guide it in the best way.

I shall return to this part of man's dharma at the close of this talk.

There is one huge difference between the painter and the sculptor of the East and those of the West:

the western painter deems that he excels in his art when he reproduces perfectly the appearance of things; he observes minutely; he reproduces with exactitude; he paints a beautiful picture; but he shows you in his picture nothing more than you can see for yourself. I crave from him something more than an exquisite reproduction of the unrealities I can myself behold without his aid. I want from him the Real irradiating the Unreal, a glimpse of the Life that veils itself in Name-and-Form, I want him to interpret Nature for me, not to photograph it for me.

Let me, to show you what I have in mind, take an example from West and from East, from Raffaele, and from Gaganendranath Tagore.

I see a woman standing with her young child in her arms, a mother and her infant. I glance at her and pass on, and forget the pair of them; it is a common sight. Raffaele saw such a pair and he painted, with them as models, the Madonna, called di San Sisto, with Her Child. What had he seen? What has he done? He had seen the Real behind the unreal, and has revealed to the world Motherhood and Infancy, the Ideal Mother, the Ideal Child. Simple, pure and stately, her face an embodied tenderness, a gentle wonder, serene, unruffled, that such a Flower of Humanity as she holds in the curve of her arm should be born of her own flesh and blood. Never can anyone who has gazed at that face, think of it but as a vision of the World-Mother, Protector of all the little helpless things of earth, strong to guard against every danger, yet so gentle and so tender that the strength is only seen as protection and never as menace. And the Child!

the beauty of Him, the delicacy of Him, the marvel of Him; the deep grave eyes, with a touch of enquiry in them, as half wondering that the world should seem so different when seen as a Without, instead of as a Within.

And when you have once seen that Motherhood and that Infancy, all mothers and all infants are touched by that Ideal, and you know that one day, far-off, yet near to faith, all mothers and all infants shall shine like that Ideal, when the Hidden God in them had become God Manifest.

Come to the East, and stand in front of a dim but all-alluring image of a range of the Himalayan snows. How wonderful they are. They draw you towards them; you are there among them; you are in that rare, tense atmosphere which takes you to its bosom, and you feel the chill as the mist enwraps you, and you are all alone, one with the eternal snows, with the mighty strength of the mountain which has become yourself. Alone? Are you so sure? Your eyes rest on the snow on that great peak, which draws your very life away, yet leaves you more living for the draining. Through the mist, through the snow, through the mountain itself, there slowly emanates from them a Face—surely a Face? Yes! there are the profound all-seeing Eyes, the calm broad forehead, like a cliff, arising above the brows—and in those Eyes all the strength of the mountain, all the magic of the snows, all the depth of the over-arching sky. It is Mahādeva! It is Shiva, the Beloved! It is the Beauty Eternal, the Youth Immortal. It is not man lifted into Godhead, but God outgazing at you through the mask of a human face.

Oh! wonderful illusion of a great Artist, who can so suggest the Indescribable as not to jar either the memory or the imagination of a devotee.

On a much lower plane is a difference I have remarked in the average Indian Artist, when he draws or paints a portrait, and his fellow-artist in the West. He does not have "sittings". He watches his subject when engaged in his various pursuits; presumably he notices expressions and stores them in his retentive memory; finally, he produces a *likeness*, of which the actual technique may be good or bad, according to his training, but it conveys something of the character of the subject, and is alive. The western artist, of the average type—I am not dealing with great artists, of course—demands many sittings and takes meticulous care to copy every physical detail, and his technique is generally fairly good; he finally produces a portrait which is without character and without life, the "sitter" having become unutterably bored during the long hours of his martyrdom, and the face having lost all expression and having become commonplace; in such cases, the first rough sketch is the best likeness, and all individuality is gradually painted out.

A similar peculiarity is seen in the eastern animal drawings and paintings; they are alive, they are moving, they are full of vivid energy; the flying bird, the bounding deer, the galloping horse, live on the canvas. One imagines that the artist has watched the creature he portrays, and, again, has stored up the images in his memory, whence he projects a composite which expresses the creature *as we see it*. One imagines the western painter studying the skeleton, the insertion of

the muscles, the photographs which show each and all the fractions of the moving muscle, which we see combined into a splendid curve or strong out-throw; while the photographs shew us the factional composition which we never see, and which therefore looks grotesque; the photograph resembles nothing in heaven or earth familiar to the human eye, which cannot, happily, register all the fractional changes which go to make the complete and perfect grace of the visible movements of the living rushing creature. Beauty lies not in the fractionised factors, but in the harmonious interreaction and co-operation of the parts into the completed whole. Memory of sense impressions and imagination are necessary to Art. Photographs of the successive constituent contractions and relaxations of the muscles are useful for the anatomical and physiological laboratories, but not for the studio. For Art is the human reflection of a ray of Beauty on beautiful objects, and Beauty is Harmony, the richer for the differences resolved into accords, and Sattva must ever dominate—not eliminate—the tumult of Rajas and the sloth of Tamas, the dissonances which lend poignancy and fullness and richness to the resultant chord. For Beauty dwells in the high region of Being, and does not herself become. In that high region is neither good nor evil, for these belong to the Becoming, and are in opposition during that process. Hence the Lord Buddha, as the Illuminated One, spoke of the Middle Path, excess and deficiency being on either side; thus courage is the middle path between its excess, which is recklessness, and its deficiency which is cowardice. Combine the related “evils” in the realm

of Becoming and you have "good" in that same realm, to which "good" and "evil" both belong. Suras and Asuras pull in opposite directions and so they churn the Ocean of Being, and produce nectar and poison—a significant allegory and full of meaning in its symbolism, when understood. But there is a perilous misunderstanding, which has led many an artist astray, perhaps because he has had a glimpse of the realm of Being; he says that Art is above morality, and that the Artist must have all experiences, good and evil, and must not be judged as are other men. He forgets that Art and the Artist are both in the realm of Becoming, that he and his art may be asuric, if he will. There is one other explanation, which I came across in the case of a great literary artist, who has now passed from earth. He was, from boyhood, in close touch with the Deva Kingdom in the astral world, wherein results are aimed at and physical means are used as needed to bring about the results. For an artist, a certain tenseness of nervous equilibrium is essential, so as to secure great sensitiveness to astral impressions. Devas of that sphere need to increase the normal sensitiveness of the nervous system, always necessary for fine artistic work, and the most easy and direct way is through sex-energy. (Some writers, especially in the West, regard the excess of this energy as being in fact the producer of Art, as the origin of Art, and as stimulating artistic expression.) The man I have in mind was normally a clean-living man, and disliked sexual irregularities; yet, from time to time, an abnormal force would overpower him and drive him from England for a short period to plunge into

wild excesses abroad. Then would follow a period of great and refined literary production.

There is one matter on which—considering how much of Indian Art is Hindū—it is necessary to touch, and that is the way in which Hindū Art in the olden times treated Devas and Divine Men, as contrasted with the Greek treatment of similar Beings, and with the paintings of some Hindū Artists who have been strongly affected by the European influence in its lower form.

The sculptures, such as bas-reliefs in early Buddhist days, do not represent the Lord Buddha except by a symbol, when they deal with incidents of His Life on earth. On first seeing an early bas-relief of worshipping the Lord Buddha, I sought in vain for the Figure of the Lord. There were many persons in varied attitudes of worship, but no Object to whom the worship was directed. On reading, I learnt that He was represented by a symbol, a footprint, a sandal, as to carve a likeness was regarded as irreverent. Later, He was freely sculptured, especially in Buddhist countries outside India, and the face tends to lose its Āryan-type, and is fashioned somewhat as that of the Mongolian Race.

In the innumerable images of the three-aspected Ishvara, Brahmā, Vishnu and Mahādeva, their Shaktis, as those of the Devas and Devīs of the various worlds of living beings, the Hindūs of the early period set the method of representation which became traditional in the religion. Beauty of face and form is not sought for in Divine Images; the task of due representation is recognised as impossible. The Images represent powers, qualities, symbols signalising incidents; or they are seated on special animals, Shiva on Nandi,

the Bull; Vishnu on Garuda, the Eagle; Brahmā on Hamsa, the Swan, and so on. They are meant to be used in worship, and to fix the attention of the worshipper on the qualities of the Object of his adoration. Rich and varied is Hindū symbology, rich and varied as the Powers in Nature which the symbols represent. The Hindū faces philosophically and equably all the phenomena of Nature, terrible or agreeable; they are all emanated from the One Love and work out His beneficent purposes, since there is but One Life, and he shares it with all that live.

The Greek, on the other hand, Lover of Beauty, saw in human Beauty the fairest thing he knew, and in the human form the highest effort of Nature. So he took that human form and deprived it of every imperfection, raised it to the most perfect thing he could imagine, and called it Apollo or Venus, clothing it with Immortal Youth; and as there were many types of Beauty, he added to each form the cachet of its type, and peopled land and sea, air and sky, grove and glade, with radiant visitants and residents, till all the world was irradiated with exquisite lives. And he placed them in the streets and in the temples, in the courts and in the theatres, in the room of the mothers of his race, and by the sacred hearth of his home, until the thoughts of the people and the atmosphere they breathed were all saturated with Beauty, until they themselves perforce grew beautiful under the constant pressure of the Idea.

Let us, in this, imitate Greece; let us make our cities beautiful; above all, let us make our schools beautiful. Let us surround the children with beauty and joy, and they shall grow into harmonious relations with each

other. Let us bring Art to the schools, the colleges, the universities, as of old, and the Arts and Crafts to our villages. Let us wear the graceful and suitable raiment of the East, not the ugly and inartistic raiment of the West. Let each of us be a messenger of Beauty, in our language, our manners, our courtesy. All this Beauty is hidden in the Indian heart, in the Indian customs; why do you hide it away, as if ashamed of it, instead of reforming those who bring uglier ways from abroad? Your dharma, as Indians, is to spread Beauty around you, and not allow yourselves to be distorted into ugliness.

Mr. Percy Brown, I.E.S., in a sympathetic little book, entitled *The Heritage of India, Indian Painting*, remarks that "the beauty of Oriental painting lies in the interpretation of form by means of a clear-cut definition . . . expresses form through a convention—the convention of pure line—and in the manipulation and the quality of this line the Oriental artist is supreme" (p. 7). In the present day, I may note in passing, the Japanese artist takes an intense pleasure in contemplating a perfect curve, the line only, and this appears to indicate an artistic quality which must belong to a special type. Mr. Brown says that practically nothing of ancient Indian Painting remains, probably because of what he calls "the devastating influence of the Indian climate," which has left, he says, only one painting of the first century B.C. But he rightly points out that the Ajantā Caves, covering some six centuries (A.D. 100 to 620) prove

an advanced state of development of perfected execution and draftsmanship. The oldest painting,

therefore, at Ajantā represents no primitive beginning, but an art of some maturity; not the first efforts of individuals groping in the darkness of inexperience, but the finished work of a School of Artists trained in a high art, manifesting great and ancient traditions. From the references to the early literature of India, dealt within the preceding chapter, it has been already inferred that painting was a fully evolved art in pre-Buddhist days, and the character of the most ancient frescoes at Ajantā serves to strengthen this supposition. (pp. 28, 29.)

"In the preceding chapter" Mr. Brown had referred to the references to painting in ancient Indian literature, which seem "to indicate that for some centuries previous to this (the specimen of the first century) painting in India was a comparatively advanced form of aesthetic expression". (p. 17.) These literary references, he considers, "are manifestly inspired by very ancient traditions, or are based on works known to be of great antiquity". (p. 18.) He gives descriptions of the use of painting in Kings' palaces and generally for decorative purposes, and mentions a work of ancient date, the *Chitralakshana*; of this he says:

This early treatise on the first principles of painting bears a close relation to a very important artistic code . . . *The Shilpa Shāstras*, an elaborate system of aesthetic laws, comprising the basis of every form of art in the country, and this has survived to the present day; the *Shilpa Shāstras* conclusively demonstrate that a scientific method of co-ordinating the

art traditions of the country in a comprehensive collection of aphorisms was a very early feature in the history of painting in India. (p. 22.)

To us who know something of the range of learning, the inclusiveness of the Indian Universities, this reference to the *Shilpa Shāstras* will be very full of meaning, and they will perhaps recall how, in the *Chhāndogyopanishat*, Nārada told the Lord Sanat-kumāra that he had studied the "fine arts," and Shri Shankarāchārya explains these as the science of making essences, of dancing, singing, music, architecture, painting, etc. Princes and nobles studied these and on returning home visited the craftsmen in their kingdoms and estates, to see that they kept up the level of their arts and crafts. Thus were preserved the art traditions of the land.

Mr. Brown's view of the supreme quality of pure line in Oriental Art is endorsed by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswami in his valuable work on *Indian Drawings*. He quotes from Blake, "whose theories of imagination and art so closely approach Oriental aesthetic":

The distinction that is made in modern times between a painting and a drawing proceeds from ignorance of art. The merit of a picture is the same as the merit of a drawing. The dauber daubs his drawings; he who draws his drawing draws his pictures..

And he himself proceeds:

This identity of draughtsmanship and painting is characteristic of the greater part of Oriental Art . . .

Drawing so defined is, in India, practically synonymous with the use of pure line produced with a fine brush. Even at Ajantā, where so much stress is laid on color-contrast and the use of black and white in masses, we have an art which is essentially one of draughtsmanship. The most essential part of the technique is the bold red line-drawing on white plaster, which forms the bases of the painting. Many writers have praised the Ajantā fresco-painters' wonderful command of line. Speaking of these frescoes, Mr. Griffiths has remarked: "The artists who painted them were giants in execution. Even on the vertical sides of the walls some of the lines which were drawn with one sweep of the brush struck me as being wonderful; but when I saw long delicate curves drawn without faltering, with equal precision, upon the horizontal surface of a ceiling, it appeared to me nothing less than miraculous. One of the students, when hoisted up on the scaffolding, tracing his first panel on the ceiling, naturally remarked that some of the work looked like child's work, little thinking that what seemed to him, up there, rough and meaningless, had been laid in with a cunning hand, so that when seen at its right distance, every touch fell into its proper place." (*Loc. cit.*, p. 1.)

This beauty of line is constantly seen in Indian drawings, and with the minimum of detail, an extraordinary force and vigor is given in the figures limned. See, for instance, Plate XX, Buffaloes, from the collection of your great countryman, Gaganendranath Tagore.

The upper one was rushing forward and has topped himself on the edge of a precipice; all the force of the rush has turned to the tremendous check which saves him from destruction; every onward-rushing energy has been reversed, the hoofs cling desperately to the ground. There is no shading; the animal might have been drawn without lifting pencil from paper; elaboration would only have weakened the effect. And the buffalo below who has bolted, and the frantically pulling figure of its keeper, now his victim, both are straining every muscle, but the brute, less tense, knowing he must win, and the desperate effort of the man, who will hold on to him to the last ounce of his strength. The ineffectual outcry of the little arm-waving figure is humorous in its very ineffectiveness. Not a superfluous line anywhere; not one that could be spared.

The Shadanga, the "Six Limbs," the Canons of Painting, the main principles of the Art, were quoted by Vatsyāyana from older works, says Mr. Brown. They are:

Rūpabheda:	Knowledge of phenomena (natural).
Pramānam:	Perspective.
Bhāva:	Physical effects of emotions.
Lāvanya Yojanam:	Grace and Beauty.
Sadrishyam:	Accurate perception.
Varnikabhanga:	Technique, and use and manipulation of media and implements.

I must turn from this excursion into some details of Indian Art, wherein we might remain for long with many study-lectures, and remind ourselves for a

moment, and only for a moment, of that groping after the painting of something more than phenomena which lie on the surface of Nature—a movement on which Dr. Stella Kramrisch has thrown some light for us in India. I mention it only because she regards it as an unconscious groping after Indian Ideals, in the attempt to give expression to the moods of feeling and thought, to the unseen workings of the human consciousness.

I have spoken of one wonderful picture belonging to that revival and advance of true Indian Art Ideals, in the renaissance identified with that gifted family of true Artists, the Tagores, that nurses in its bosom the rightful Infant Heir of the heritage of India's Art Ideals in the Past, the Infant who, in the future, in the maturity of India's Art Ideals, shall give to the world the priceless gift of an Art which shall redeem it alike from materialism and superstition, and shall make the life of the Nation and the life of the individual full of Beauty, in the cottage as well as in the palace, for Art, as I have oftentimes said, must be no longer a luxury for the rich, but the daily bread of the poor. That is part of India's dharma.

For Beauty diversified into the Arts is the true refiner and uplifter of humanity, for it is the instrument of Culture, the broadener of the heart, the purifying Fire which burns up all prejudices, all pettiness, all coarseness. Without it, true Democracy is impossible equality of social intercourse an empty dream. Art is the international language, in which mind can speak to mind, heart to heart, where lips are dumb. Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Music, these need no translations, they speak the Universal Mother-tongue.

Centuries do not age them. Custom does not stale them. Boundaries do not exist for them. Their message is for every country, for every tongue. Art will permeate the whole atmosphere of the New Civilisation which is on the threshold. Religion and Art have ever been twin-angels. Let us follow them as they point to the East, where the fair Dawn Maidens are tinting our earth-born clouds with their rose-tipped fingers, to welcome the Rising Sun of India, as He leaps across the horizon, and floods our world with the glory of His Unveiled Face.
